TYRANNY AND HYPOCRISY Detected:

OR,

A further Discovery of the Tyrannical-Government, Popish-Principles, and vile Practices of the now-Leading *Quakers*.

BEING

A Defence of the Letter, intituled, **The Spirit of the Hat**, against the Deceitful, Defective and Railing Answer, called *The Spirit of Alexander, &c.*

With a Challenge,

To refer the Judgment of Matters of Fact to the Verdict of Twelve Impartial Judges, equally chosen.

Also, Many of their Letters, Papers, and Transactions among themselves are made publick; wherein they contradict one another, and attribute Titles to *GEORGE FOX*, that are proper only to *CHRIST*.

But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be made manifest unto all men.

London, Printed for *Fr. Smith*, at the Elephant and Castle in *Cornhil*, near the Royal Exchange, 1673.

TYRANNY

AND

HYPOCRISY

Detected:

Tyranny and Hypocriſie detected.

HOW dangerous a thing it is for a man to ingage himſelf publickly for any ſingular party upon the account of Religion, is greatly manifeſt in the leading *Quakers*, and eſpecially in *W. Pen*, from whoſe Parts and Education one would expect more than ordinary Candor and Ingenuity: but having imbarked himſelf among thoſe People, (who alſo by their Tenets are peculiarly diſpoſed to have a high opinion of themſelves, and to contemn all others) and having obtained a high repute among them, he betakes himſelf to ſuch pitiful ſhifts, ſcurrilities and bravings to uphold their detected Cauſe and tottering Kingdom, as one would think could not proceed from any man profeſſing Chriſtianity. He that would have this evidently proved, let him read his late controverſal Writings, eſpecially his *Winding-ſheet*, and *Spirit of Alexander*.

After the Spirit of the now-*Quakers* or *Foxonians*, detected to be none of Chriſt's, by ſeverall Pieces that have come forth of late; at length the Book intituled *The Spirit of the Hatt* made publick, diſcovers their principles and practices in their government amongſt themſelves, to be far different from what

they profeſs openly when they invite people to be *Quakers*: and that they act upon the ſame principles, and in the ſame Tyrannical manner (as far as their power reaches) as the Court at Rome: And this not only proved by inſtances of matters of fact, ſeen and heard for the moſt part by the Author himſelf; but alſo argued and compared with that principle which was held forth as the foundation of their way, and upon which he (certainly not one of the leaſt ingenious among them) became a *Quaker*.

What was now to be expected from theſe men thus detected, may be ſeen in their *Spirit of Alexander the Copper-Smith*, or *Anſwer to the Spirit of the Hatt*; which I ſhall in ſhort make ſome remarks upon.

And firſt we may obſerve, that (like contentious women) where the matter is moſt evident againſt them, there they make the greateſt noiſe, and are moſt clamorous and furious; and make the greateſt ſhow of confidence and victory: when the deſign of their owne vain-glory and greatneſs is manifeſted not onely by thoſe that have conſidered them in their publick appearance; but alſo by ſome within themſelves that are privy to their *Cabals* and private tranſactions, then *the Divil* muſt needs *be hard beſet, and his condition deſperate*; ſee *Spt. of Alex. p.* 1. becauſe the foundations of their Kingdom ſhake, and their ſubjects diſcover it, and ſeek to withdraw themſelves from their territories. Who could have made a more apt inference from ſuch premiſes?

2. That though they call this Author's Relation, *Lies, Forgery, Defamation*, with abundance of terms of the like *Foxonian* leaven, yet when they come to particulars, they either, 1. confeſs what they deny with

with an idle distinction, (except some few things;) or, 2. Acknowledge them by saying nothing concerning them; or 3, use some deceit in their terms of denial, which every Reader cannot discover; or 4. take an occasion from some circumstances, perhaps not rightly set down, to deny the whole matter.

3. That *W. P.* doth in their names acknowledge that the substance of this Authors complaint is true, (Hist. p. 14, 15. in his p. 8.) namely, that *they required him to yeild* [to their determination against conscience] *because the Body would have it so, saying that was yeilding to the Power.* And he under- oppositon to the Author, *That his not so but persisting, is dissention; but their disown-ing* [excommunicating and depriving of a liberty of marrying, burying &c.] *any person for that cause, is no breach of the great Gospel-Charter of Liberty.*

This is that which *W. P.* labours to do, and for that purpose useth no other Arguments than the Papists in the like case, who are the onely persons that I know of that challenge such a power; for the Protestants do not challenge it: the *Church of England* challenges onely a prudential power of determining some Ceremonies, as of the Surplice, Cross and Kneeling, to be convenient at this time: but not by vertue of an infallible Spirit, or as of Divine Authority; which the *Romanists* do, and the *Quakers*. As for the Arguments that this Author urges against this usurpation, *W. P.* passes them by, and gives, instead of answers, clamours and railings against him. As for the Arguments that *W. P.* useth, they being the same with those of the *Papists* against the *Protestants*, they may be found answered and refuted every where in Protestant writings.

4. But that which this Author doth chiefly insist on, and which indeed is most proper for him, and the choice and prosecution of it renders him Ingenious, is, That in this Doctrine and Practice of theirs, they manifestly contradict the chief principle and main foundation they at first held forth, whereby they have commended themselves to the world, and have gained to be their Proselytes some honesthearted people, and among the rest this Author. For indeed the *Quakers* chief principle, namely, *That every one ought diligently to take heed to, and walk according to the Light in himself*, is of such evident truth in the plain sense of the terms, that there can scarce be found either Christian or Heathen, (that understands what he saith) that can deny it; for it is in substance this, *That every man ought diligently to observe and do what God doth by any meanes convince him to be his Duty.* Now considering that this was cryed up by the *Quakers*, as the old Truth brought to light by them, 'twas no wonder that their Doctrine was received by some wel-minded people, that were not so happy as to know themselves aforehand to be possessors of this common principle; and there's no question but all of them that do it honestly, do it upon the same ground: But herein lyes *the mystery* of their iniquity, (which this man has been so ingenious and happy as to discover,) namely, *That he who shall receive the forementioned principle as evident in his own heart, shall afterward be induced to believe that whatever the cheif Quakers teach, is as evident, and that this evidence is from the immediate Revelation of God's infallible Spirit within himself.* But if it happen that the leading men contradict one another (notwithstanding they profess the infallible Light to be their guide) then he that

has

has the ſtrongeſt intereſt among the Elders ſhall judg the other party, and if he or they do not ſubmit themſelves to this judgment, he ſhall be condemned in the name of the Lord, and deprived of all both Eccleſiaſtick and civil priviledges, which they can by any means hinder him of. And beſides, if he make any publick complaint, and do not conform to their wills, they will then load him with all poſſible reproaches, and rather than fail, they'll ſay he is broken in his brain or diſtracted, as they did of *John Pennyman*; ſo if he be a man, who in reſpect of his Trade or Calling, doth depend upon them or thoſe they have intreſt in, he and his family ſhall be pitileſsly ruined. This is the ſubſtance of what this Author has ſet forth, and which *W. P.* defends.

5. Now who this Auchor is I know not, and I do not perceive him concerning himſelf to make any reply to the *Quakers* railings; perhaps he thinks (as the truth is,) that his vindication is ſo evident to every one that will but impartially read his Letter, that there's no need of more. For who can otherwiſe than preſume this man capable of giving a juſt and true account of the *Quakers* chief principle upon which himſelf was owned, and receiv'd by them, and continued with them ſome years? And 2. who can read and not clearly perceive that the practice he found among them doth abſolutely ſubvert that principle? For if every man muſt upon pain of ſin walk according to *the Light in his own particular*, then he cannot without ſin walk according to *the Light in* G. Fox, *or other Men*, when that is contrary or diverſe from his own. *See Cont. Dial. p.63, 64, 65.*

6. As for my ſelf and other Chriſtians, this Letter

ſerves us moſt effectually to prove, 1. That theſe *Quakers* their crying up *the Light within*, or *the infallible rule and guidance of the Holy Spirit in every particular Conſcience as the ſupream Judge*, is but a ſhooing-horn to draw people in, and that when they are brought over to them by that means, then they muſt be ruled and guided by the judgment of *G. Fox* and the ruling Elders: So 'tis manifeſt, They preach that in their Doctrine, which they contradict in their practice. 2. That ſome *Quakers* (and it's more than probable that the moſt of them) believe and practiſe by tradition and imitation of their Leaders, perſwading themſelves in the mean time that they are taught by an infallible Light in themſelves ſo to do. 3. That the Body of the *Quakers* conſiſts of ſuch a ſort of implicite Beleivers; for when this man and his Companions gave themſelves ſo much liberty as to examine things to find a particular conviction, they could find no ſuch thing; and its eaſy to perceive by his reaſoning, that he is more able to examine things than one of a thouſand of them. So that, 4. Quakeriſme properly is not built upon that Principle rightly underſtood, viz. *Every man ought to believe and practiſe according to the Light in himſelf*; (for in that reſpect we and all honeſt men are *Quakers*,) but upon a falſe and miſtaken notion and ſenſe of it, viz. That *what the leading men teach for the Light in every man, is indeed ſo.* 5. This inſtance gives a full anſwer to that common evaſion of the *Quakers*: when we plead that we alſo walk according to the Light of God in us, they preſently reply, that *we are of the world, and in the cuſtoms and reaſonings of it; but if we would come out of the world, and be obedient as they are, we ſhould experience the Truth, as they do*: Well! we

have

have here an experienced man (and he's not alone) that has given obedience (as they) to the Light in himself, which because it contradicts the will of *G. Fox* and the Ruling-Elders, he is disowned by them. Now then, 'tis evident they would not have us to follow the Light in our selves, but the Light in *Geo. Fox*, &c. and that the Assurance and Infallibility from Experience they talk of, is meerly a strong Confidence in *G. Fox* and his Companions.

7. But to come to the particulars of the Cause; *We are bespatter'd* (saith *W. Pen*, p. 4, 5.) *because we abhor, renounce, and rebuke with severity that rude Imagination of the* *Hat *on in publick Prayer, which did we use, we should but be esteemed by you* [Professors] *the worse.*

Answ. Very likely, Sir; But do you order your selves in the Worship of God by the reason of gaining our esteem? Why do you not answer your Friend's Argument drawn from your own Principles? You acknowledge a Respect and Reverence due unto Magistrates; but you deny them that of the Hat: why? *Because it's low and perishing, and may be trampled on, there's no solidity in it; The Hat-honour, Hat-worship, Hat-humility is an honour below: but men that be in the Law of God, they mind not the Hat*; G. F. And will you give that as a reverence to God, which you say is too low for men? Doth *G. Fox* say in Print to them that keep on their Hat at your Prayers, *You give no more reverence unto God than unto a Horse*; and yet keep it on before Princes and Governours, to whom

**G. F.* did not so in the Book, entituled, *True honour amongst the Jews*, p. 7. *And is not this Cap-honour from below, and worshiping the Beast and Dragon?* And p. 9. *For the bowing the Hat is a will-worship.*

whom he allows at leaſt more reverence than to a Horſe? But whence is the obligation of putting off the Hat at Prayer? The *Quakers* do not pretend the Authority of the Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 11. 4. *Every man praying or propheſying with his head covered, diſhonoureth his head*; And *John Perrot* has long ago urged that againſt them: For if it be unlawful to cover the head in Prayer, 'tis ſo alſo in Propheſying or Declaring, which notwithſtanding they practiſe: if the one be lawful, the other cannot be unlawful. And *why* (ſaith our Author) *ſhould it be lawful to have the head covered when a Miniſter returns high praiſes to the Lord, and matter of Excommunication to do the ſame in time of his Prayer?* p. 33. We ſay, There's no Divine Command for it; it becomes an outward token of reverence to God from the cuſtom of the Country that uſeth it for ſuch toward men. Therefore in the Eaſtern Countries where they uſe it not for a reverence to men, neither do they uſe it toward God, but have their heads covered at publick Prayer. *G. F.* p. 10. *The Jews did not put off their Hats when they went into the Synagogues or Temples, &c.* P. 11. *The Prieſt was not to uncover his head in the Sanctuary* (Lev. 21. 10.) *which is contrary to the Prieſts now in the Temple.* P. 4. *And the Turks count it an odious or hateful practice to put off the Hat:* (*yet they are to honour.*) How come then the *Quakers*, who abhor the Cuſtoms of the World, to retain this in the Worſhip of God? Did *G. F.* in this matter forget himſelf? or, had he a ſpecial Revelation for it? A ſpecial Revelation without doubt, if it be true that he doth nothing without one; Well! that's enough to juſtifie him in ſo doing: But how comes he *to require other men to practiſe it, when they*

are

are not convinced of it? O (ſaith *Pen*) *I utterly renounce that, in our Friend's name, as an infamous ſlander: But* (ſaith he) *we will be well ſatisfied with any Members diſpractice of an orderly performance, once cheerfully owned.* p. 10. Is not this a deep-ſtudyed Man think ye, that could find out ſuch a learned diſtinction? Nay, but probably he will pretend he writes by Revelation: So then, they do not require Men to practiſe what they are not convinced of: but they require men not to diſpractiſe what they are not convinced of. I had always thought that two Negatives in Engliſh make an Affirmitive; and ſo, that *not to diſpractiſe* is the ſame as *to practiſe*: Let the learned world vail to *W. Pen*! But he means that they require men *not to leave off to practiſe, what they have practiſed*: (what! though they practiſed without conſideration, or conviction? Yes:) *That is* (ſaith Pen) *moſt reaſonable and orderly*, P. 10. If once you become a Quaker, and do, as they do, let the inducement be the Opinion you have of *G. Fox* or what it will, if ever you diſſent from them in the leaſt Ceremony, you are an Apoſtate, and ſhall be deale with accordingly; as it ſeems our Author was.

8. But how will *W. Pen's* learned diſtinction ſerve the caſe of the Maid? who being required of *John Bolton*, by vertue of an Order from *G. F.* to ſew up the ſlit in her Waiſtcoat-skirt behind, anſwered that *ſhe ſaw no evil in it*; and *James Claypole* thought it ſutable to their principle, *that ſhe ſhould firſt ſee the evil of it in her ſelf, before ſhe judged it, and not* (ſaith he) *becauſe we ſay it: But the poor man* (as ſaith our Author, p. 29.) *was fain to acknowledge his error in it, though in private he confeſt it* (to *G. Welch*, of which 'tis believed *John Oſgood* is not ignorant) *to be*

no error: But I know not how it comes to paſs, but *J. Claypole* is as ſubtile in diſtinguiſhing here as *W. Pen* himſelf: *The intent of my words* (ſaith he) *was, that every one ſhould be left to God's Witneß in their Conſciences, to condemn what that condemns, and to juſtifie what that juſtifies, and not to condemn or juſtifie barely upon the motion or judgment of others.* This he aſſerts: and the Slander he denies is this; *That the Tyranny of their Elders is ſuch, as to impoſe upon the weak and ſimple that which they cannot believe:* And the miſapprehenſion upon which he was called to judgment was, *as if* (ſaith he) *my words had extended ſo far, as that nothing was to be accounted an evil, unleß the guilty party ſaw it to be ſo.* The Queſtion is touching a thing not in its own nature evil, the meaning muſt be this; *That the ſlit in the maid's waiſtcoat muſt be accounted an evil, becauſe G. Fox had judg'd it to be ſo*; and the made muſt ſew it up, (as many others had done upon the ſaid Order) though ſhe her ſelf ſaw no evil in it. What now doth this come ſhort of *requiring to practiſe before conviction*, or *impoſing upon the weak what they cannot believe*, except they be reſolved to believe as the Church believs? Are theſe men fit to be talked to, that dare affront the world with ſuch deceiful defences as theſe are? Is this your glorious liberty, ye members of the *Quakers* Body? That if ye ſubmit not to the Law of *G. F.* or the ruling-Elders, ye ſhall be accounted *Belialites* and *in the Spirit of Ranteriſm, ranting Spirits*, and to be dealt with accordingly! *The beſt words utter'd from Chriſt in the dayes of his fleſh*, (ſaith G. Keith) *and yet recorded in Scripture, cannot reveal the Father*: but it ſeems the words of *G. F.* or the Elders can reveal the Fathers will, even in things poſitive

ſitive, and ſo are of greater efficacy aud authority than Chriſt's. He that can ſay any thing, can reconcile theſe things with what *W. P.* ſayth in his caveat againſt Popery, p. 8. who, ſpeaking againſt *the determinations of general Councills, as requiſite to be indiſpenſibly obey'd*, infert's, that ſo *the morall or doctrinall good or evil of an Act or principle (in and from a mans owne judgment) ſhall not be obliging; but he muſt be bound againſt his owne ſenſe, reaſon and faith.*

9. Now I think the liberty, or rather ſlavery, the *Quakers* are in one to another, is manifeſt; Let us next ſee what liberty they allow to the world; that is, to Chriſtians who are not of their Body, particularly to Presbyterians, Independents, Baptiſts; to them *G. F.* will not allow liberty, becauſe they are not *in the Power or Truth*: But *W. P.* never wants a *Salvo* for *George*, let him ſay what he will: *He meant it* (ſaith he) *not of outward but of inwardly Liberty*: And yet *W. P.* knew it was ſpoken to one, (at a meeting at Devonſhire-houſe) who pleaded for Liberty of Conſcience about his Hat, which is an outward exerciſe; But why we ſhould imagin they would give Liberty, whoſe both Principles and and Practices are againſt it, I know not; of both which we have in theſe ſheets a fair account. For, 1. They pretend to an infallible Judgment in all matters of Religion, whereby the poſſibility of being in Truth to Perſons differing from them, is quite taken away. 2. They account him a *Ranting Spirit*, who ſhall not account that evil, (even in matters of Ceremony) which they account evil, *after due admonition, &c.* And is it conſiſtent with any Government in the World to tolerate *Ranters*? 3. They do frequently

quently impute to men thoſe crimes as manifeſt, that are juſtly puniſhable by the Magiſtrate; ſuch as are, *Malicious Acts, Slanders, Injurious Lying, Deſigns to Miſchief, Injuſtice, a Murdering Mind, Sacriledge, Villany, &c.* So that if *W. Pen*'s reaſoning againſt the Baptiſts in his Epiſtle before *Plain Dealing, &c.* be valid, then the Quakers will certainly perſecute; for thus he ſaith, *But this notably ſhews their ſpirit, who thus adventure to perſecute* [viz. *by revilings*] *without power: Let who will believe they would not do it if they had power; for my own part* (ſaith he) *I declare my ſelf none of that number.* Now I appeal to the ſober judgment of all men that are converſant in reading Books, whether they ever met with any writings ſo full of reviling and ill-bread language upon ſuch ſlight grounds as thoſe of the *Quakers.* 4. It's ſo notoriouſly true what this Author ſaith, *that he hath ſeen pulling down, haling out, and thruſting forth of their Meetings, and that they went as far as their Power, and conſequently wanted not Will, but Power, to puniſh:* Yea, it's ſo manifeſt to thoſe that have uſed their Meetings, that *W. P.* in appealing to God's holy Witneſs in all Conſciences for their vindication, diſcovers himſelf a man greatly to be lamented as either blind or impudent. Let *Francis Chadwel* tell of the uſage he has found amongſt them. Have they not added *puſhing, pinching, kicking,* and *hard-treading upon feet and toes* to thoſe other violences? But *W. P.* anſwers, that they never refuſed Conſcientious Inquirers, and would be informed, *if ever they ſo uſed any conſcientious Inquirer or oppoſer.* Let us name who we will, I dare warrant he'll never allow any of them to have been conſcientious. I have ſeen ſome Papers of one *William King* a

Quaker,

Quaker, and who upon that account has expoſed himſelf to impriſonment for ſpeaking in the *Quakers* Meetings. But he complains of the ſame uſage from the *Quakers* as from their perſecutors; that he has been hal'd down out of their Gallery in Grace-church-ſtreet with ſuch violence that he has ſcarce felt the ſtairs; that *he has often felt their cruel hands*; that *G. Whitehead*, being in a great rage and fury at *Jer. Clerk's* houſe, gave him a ſore pinch in the arm; that they would not ſuffer him to be a priſoner (tho for the ſame cauſe) among them, but procur'd that he ſhould be keept in the common-priſon, with a great deal to the ſame purpoſe: Now becauſe he doth in ſome things diſagree with their judgment, they deal with him in this manner: Nay, moreover, he ſaith, *G. Whitehead* and others came to *Henry Pawſon* and his wife, with whom he lodged, and charg'd them not to entertain him, thereby indeavouring what they could to force him out of the Land. Now perhaps they will ſay *W. King* is a mad man; if he be, they ought to ſhow more compaſsion towards him and not to deal with him in that cruel manner they do; but for my part I ſee nothing in his Papers, which doth not become a *Quaker*, and is not ſutable to their Principles. There are ſeveral other Inſtances of their uſing Violence in their Meetings, which may be urg'd as occaſion ſhal ſerve; And their Paper againſt *John Pennyman* when he was in Priſon, may ſhow what ſpirit they are of. Nay, they would not ſpare that grave ancient Gentlewoman *Anne Mudd*, who being moved to ſpeak a few words among them, before their Speakers began, *Thomas Matthews*, who guarded the ſtairs, pulled her away by violence. Theſe are the People that in former dayes have vex'd

and

and disquieted all sorts of Religious Assemblies with their Messages (as they said) from the Lord, and have clamour'd against those as Persecuters, that could not otherwise obtain their peace than by thrusting or carrying them out; and yet themselves do the same and worse, not only to those of a contrary mind and Judgment, but also to those of the same Mind and Principle, even when they profess (as themselves) to be moved thereto of the Lord. The *Jews* at *Venice* permitted the *Quakers* to speak in their Synagogues, but that the *Quakers* will not allow others. They have professedly denied to permitt any of their Religion to marry a Christian, or one of the world, how honest and pious soever, if not in their way; Witness *Oliver Holmes*, *W. Mucklow* and many others: And *W. Pen* owns it as a peice of, not only just, but necessary punishment to be inflicted upon him that is not a *Quaker*, or him that is so in all things but the Ceremony of the Hat in Prayer, that if he could not get a wife save among the *Quakers*, he should never have one: See his p. 10. where he calls such an one's dissent, *Imaginations and Whimseys. As for their denying such an one a burial, though they would deny it him alwayes as one of them, but especially their now usurping his property in a burial-place, is* (he sayth) *a down-right forgery.* Kindness! They would not suffer such an one to stinck above ground, but he should be buryed, not among the Catholicks, but as Hereticks in *Spain* or *Italy*: But it is so notorious and common with them (as they that have been among them report) to deprive such disowned persons of their property in the burying-place, that I wonder with what face they can deny it, or what evasion they can have for it. Did they not *Tho. Fi-*

sher,

ſher, and did not *J. Bolton* deny it to *W. Mucklow* &c. Did they not make void from the Hat-men (as they called them) the Notes they had for the uſe of the Burying-place preſently after the Papers of Orders by the 11 Elders? and did not theſe men's money pay for it?

11. As for *John Oſgood's Cabbaliſtick Harangue*, which is pretended to be *for the clearing of God's Truth and People*, in the matter of his concern, it's ſo far from that, that it confirms what is ſaid by our Author againſt the *Quakers*, but ſhews that *John Oſgood* is now, by joyning with them and becoming a Preacher among them, become another man; ſo that inſtead of complaining againſt, (as formerly) he ſeeks to cover, the iniquities of his Brethren: For whilſt he doth in general terms deny all, he doth in particular deny nothing at all. Read p. 30, 31, 32. of *the Spirit of the Hat*, and he either ſayes nothing to thoſe things that are there related, or confeſſeth to that which he would ſeem to deny. He ſays p. 21. *the oppoſition he had, related not to his Marriage, as a Marriage, or to hinder his proceed therein: but that the Meeting could not paſs it, as their approvement, he being not in unity with the Meeting as to that matter aforeſaid*, viz. of giving teſtimony againſt the Spirit of the Hat, which he did already in his practice diſapprove. And what doth our Author ſay more? and how could this acute man ſay, *the Meeting would not hinder his Proceed in his Marriage, when they would not approve of his Marrying, without which Approvement he could not legally proceed?* But the Mother of his Bride, *Rebekah Trevers*, being a great Mother and Governeſs among them, cryes out then in her own and Daughters concern, that *their*

cruelty was worse than that of the Bishops; and so by her Authority, and *J. Osgoods* Interest, they proceed to Marriage without Licence; which was so offensive to *John Bolton*, that he publickly disowned *Tho. Salthouse* (one of their Ministers) for being a Witness to it, and for his Moderation.

12. Let us now proceed to other Instances mentioned in *the Spirit of the Hat*, whereby it will evidently appear, that the great zeal, labours and sufferings of the leading *Quakers* tend chiefly to their owne ambition, and to the obtaining of a Lordly power & domination over the Persons and Consciences of their Proselytes: and that they use most wicked wayes and means for accomplishing these ends. And that which first offers it self in this service, is that instance of *G. Fox* menioned p. 28. which the *Quakers* in their *Spirit of Alexander* &c. say nothing to; and therefore we may well conclude it for truth, and that they had nothing to say in excuse of it; for it is a most considerable charge against the Man of their adoration, whom they can scarce mention without an Epithet of praise, as, of, *innocent*, *good*, *holy*, *upright Man of God*, *Prophet indeed*, and the like: That saying of *S. Eccles*, cited by our Author, wherein that which is spoken of Jesus, or the True Light *Joh.* 1. 10. is applyed to *G. F.* who is also said to be *that true Prophet*, *whom John said he was not*; which is no other but Christ; This Blasphemous Testimony was complained of by some of the *Quakers* themselves, but they could not prevaile that it might be recall'd, for *G. Fox* had approv'd it both before and after it was printed; but they got *S. Eccles* to write an explication of it, which made the matter so much the worse, that it was thought good to suppress that

And

And notwithſtanding, theſe complaints from ſeveral hands, yet I never could hear that *G. Fox* reprov'd him for it; but he made him one of his ſelect Diſciples to accompany him in his travels for the propagation of his Goſpel in *America*. Where (as is related in the Account of his proceedings read in the *Quakers* Meeting here at *London*) he ſent for at one time an Emperour and two Kings to come and hear him, and they gave their attendance to the great Prophet *G. Fox, at whoſe name* (as was writ formerly by one of their Miniſters) *even the Heathen tremble*. The ſaid *S. Eccles* at a publick Meeting celebrated him in theſe words: *Bleſſed be the man that came out of the North: Bleſſed be the womb that bare him, and the paps that gave him ſuck*: And *Joſiah Coal* an eminent *Foxonian* Miniſter writes thus to *G. Fox* from Barbado's.

21 *day* 12 *month*. 1658.

'Dear *G. Fox*, who art the Father of many nations, 'whoſe life hath reach'd through us thy children, 'even to the Iſles afar off, to the begetting of many 'again unto a lively hope, for which Generations to 'come ſhall call thee *Bleſſed*; whoſe being and habitation is in the power of the Higheſt, in which 'thou *rules and governes* in Righteouſneſs, and thy '*Kingdom* is eſtabliſh'd in peace, and the increaſe 'thereof is *without end*.

This great Prophet (I ſay) is charg'd by our Author with opening Letters and altering the Contents, that he took a Letter of *John Whiteheads* (a moſt eminent Miniſter among the *Quakers*) which was writ by him (as he ſaid) in the name of the Lord, and blotted out a line or more, and wrote, or cauſed to be

writ, to a quite contrary ſenſe, to wit, *That he did judge thoſe that kept the Hat on, and not thoſe that kept it off*, (or words to this effect) whereas *John Whitehead* did therein *juſtify both thoſe that kept it off or on, &c.* This Letter was (as I am informed) ſent into *Holland* to the *Quakers* there, which comming to the hands of *Benj. Furly*, he diſcovered the forgery, and it was ſent back again; and being complained of at a private Meeting by *John Osgood*, *William Penington* and *John Pennyman* &c. and *John Bolton* putting on't to *John Whitehead*, whether he did not give *G. Fox* liberty to alter it, ſaid, *No*, not any liberty to alter a ſubſtance, which he ſaid that was, and at another time ſaid he was abuſed therein, *&c.* Let the world ſee by this Inſtance from what Spirit it is theſe men ſpeak and write in the name of the Lord, when they can ſo flatly contradict one another! (more of this afterwards.) Let the world ſee alſo the *Quakers* way of anſwering Books, when they can ſlip over ſuch a charge as this againſt their chief Propher, which containes in it, that which, for the nature and kind of it, is one of the greateſt crimes that morrals can be guilty of. 'Tis the ſame with that of *Ananias* and *Sapphira* his wife, (*Act.* 5.) which the Apoſtle *Peter* animadverted upon them by a miraculous infliction of Death: for as he and his wife conſented to bely the Holy Ghoſt, (as *Eraſmus* allows, and other learned men ſenſe it) to wit, by pretending an inſpiration and motion from the Spirit of God for the doing of that which they had no inſpiration for, and knew they had none: So alſo *G. Fox* doth in this Letter make *John Whitehead* with the Holy Spirit to write that in the name of the Lord, which *G. F.* knew that neither he nor the Spirit did write any

ſuch

ſuch thing, but the contrary. Thus he doth at once belie both *John Whitehead* and the Holy Spirit of God, and that knowingly. For I do not doubt but the *Quakers* do frequently write and ſpeak that in the name of the Lord, and as from his infallible Spirit, which is falſe, but they perſwade themſelves, it is true; but here we have *G. F.* writing that for the words of the Lord, and the judgment of the infallible Spirit in *John Whitehead*, which he himſelf knew to be falſe. O Prodigious Impudence! He that counterfeits any mans name in a matter of any concernment deſerves to be expoſed on a Pillory, and to loſe his ears: how much greater puniſhment doth he deſerve that counterfeits both the name of God and man, in a matter of religious concern? Neither may they hereafter pretend, in their excuſe for this omiſſion, that *G. Fox*, the man chiefly concern'd, was abſent; for both *John Bolton* and *Samuel Newton* (two Zealots againſt the Hat-men) were both preſent at the ſaid private Meeting, and ſtood in the juſtification of the alteration, and others that are here preſent know very well the circumſtances of this buſineſs; and it's like ſome of them, as well as *G. Whitehead*, were privy to the aforeſaid forgery, as *Sapphira* was to that of her husband *Ananias*. This is the courſe that *G. F.* took to make his injunctions be obſerved as well in *Holland* as in *England*.

13. The next inſtance ſhal be that of *M. Bowman* and *Eliz. Baily*, mentioned *p.* 33. Now you muſt know that *G. F.* and his Peers have, under pretence *of good and comly Order*, at length injoyned all *Quakers* that will marry, that they firſt come before the Meeting and refer the matter to them, and acquieſce in their determination, who will be ſure not to paſs

it, if the party desiring Marriage, one or t'other, differ from them in the least Ceremony, as appears in that of *J. Osgood*, that of *W. Mucklow*, and in that of *Oliver Holms* and * others also in this I am about; For it seems *Eliz. Baily* was a thorow *Quaker*, and *M. Bowman* differed very little from a *Quaker*, and had testimony given of him that he was a sober man, and no Hypocrite, but was not yet in the full practice of all their little Ceremonies, for he would sometimes put off his Hat in Salutation. These two came before the Mens Meeting and found so much favour among them that some of the Preachers *declared positively, as from the Lord, that it was to pass: whereof one* Tho. Briggs *was transported with such an angry zeal*, that he told the opposers, *it was of the Lord, and they opposed the mind of the Lord.* But the poor man was so far from knowing the mind of the Lord in that matter, that he did not know who the Persons were of whom he spake; others of the Elders opposed it, having on their side the authority of *G. Fox's* Order; the contest between them was high and long, and in this dissention they parted for that time. To this relation, as set down by our Author, the Answerers say nothing, and so we shall take the truth of it *pro confesso*, and make

* *An honest plain Couple came before the Mens Meeting, desired to be married. Their Integrity was fully attested: yet, because the Man could not say (after Prayer and Fasting for resolution in the Question) that he thought it an evil to go and be married with the Priests according to the Law; they would not pass it. Others they have refused for carrying great Guns in their Ships: and yet* John Thompson *a Quaker, Master of a Ship, owned by* G. R. S. N. *and other Quakers, not only carried Guns, but fought stoutly, and killed many of the Dutch before his being taken.*

make ſome improvement of it.

1ſt. We may ſee by this what the infallibility is which theſe Leading-men ſo highly glory in: It is onely a daring confidence whereby they aſſert things to be infallible and in the name of the Lord upon ſuch weak grounds as other men cannot build a ſtrong probability upon.

2dly. That they do even in their Meetings blaſpheme the Name of the Lord, a ſin not leſs than Murder or Adultery, and which was (under the Law) to be puniſhed with no leſs puniſhment, even Death: See *Deut.* 18. 20. For whilſt they contradict one another in the Name of the Lord, of neceſſity one of the Parties (what ever the other) doth blaſpheme God's Name.

3dly. That this Contradiction which they aſcribe to the Name of the Lord, is a proper effect of their preſent principle, as underſtood by them; for whilſt they aſſert that every *Quaker* is to follow the immediate teaching of the Light in himſelf as the infallible will of God, and have no way or means by their principle to diſcern one immediate teaching from another; and are manifeſtly, by reaſon of their Education, Paſſions and Intereſts, diverſly inclined in judging; it is morally impoſſible but that (eſpecially in leſſer matters) they ſhould have contrary ſtrong perſwaſions, which they muſt account the Teachings of the Lord, and aſſert in his name: and by this and other inſtances we ſee by experience it is ſo. And hence,

4thly, We ſee clearly what our Author aſſerts, That in the determinations in their Aſſemblies, when there are any hearty and conſcientious diſſenters, they apoſtatize from their principles, and betake themſelves to the principles and practices of the Church of

Rome, giving the final judgment of their faith and duty to that Party, man, or men among them, which shall have the greatest Interest in their esteem, or by advantage of his witt, confidence, zeal, arrogance, &c. can over-power and subdue the rest. Therefore we see here when the Elders were somewhat equally divided, they could not come to any determination; so in *Perrot's* case and his Party about *the Hat*, whilst *Perrot's* party was strong and numerous, and himself in credit, they permitted them to use their liberty; then in *Rich. Hubbertborne's* answer to *Jo. Parrot's* Paper about the Hat, sent by *G. Whitehead* to *I. P.* at *Isaac Penington's*, and which was approved by *G.F. &c.* were these words, *Then no such reasonings had we had, if so be the free Spirit of the Lord had been minded, which is not to be limitted neither to the keeping on the Hat, nor off the Hat in time of Prayer.* And in the year 1661, there was a Meeting at *W. T's* House with *G. Fox. F. H. G. W. R. H.* and *J. Perrot* about the Hat, they supposing that *Jo. Perrot* had injoyned the keeping of it on in Prayer, which he denyed, and declared both by words and writing, *that he did leave all to the free universal Spirit &c. and made not a Law for any man.* So it was concluded upon by them all, that there was to be no imposition on either hand, but every one was to be left free therein: Of this *J. Osgood* and many others are witnesses. But when *Perrot* began to decline and lose his credit, then *G. Fox* and his Party take the advantage, condemn his principle and practice, require conformity of all that will be own'd for members of their Body, that is, that will not be excommunicated, & accounted Ranting Spirits, as *G.F. J.B. &c.* called them. The Papists place Infallibility in the determination of One

Pope,

Pope, or One Council, or One Pope and Council together: But these Quakers place *Infallibility* in every particular Person, and consequently no other Person or Persons whatsoever have any power to determine against him, for so an equal should have power over an equal, an infallible over an infallible, which is absurd: For a Body consists of particular Persons, every of which is no more infallible one than another; and there being many together, adds nothing of infallibility to them, because infallibility is the highest certainty, and doth not admit of degrees. So that a single Person that is infallible is not more or less infallible, because many or none are of his mind: And if this particular Person may err, that also, and every one of that Body: consequently there can be no infallible decision of any controversy between them, but that which is made by number, interest, force, cunning or the like, none of which will any man in his witts say, is any ground of infallibility, except upon the Arguments of the * Church of *Rome*, which quite subvert the Quakers principle.

*W.P. *saith, that God hath given greater judgment to his Church than to the individual members of it, is a true position, and the Church of Rome errs not in that, but in accounting themselves a true Church.*

5thly. We see by their assuming to themselves the power of judging in such matters, & by their severity in enforcing those things that tend to their Being and Reputation, as a distinct & eminent Body, even against their primitive principles, that their design is not (as one would have thought at first) to engage people to a diligent observance of the Light in their own Consciences, but to make them acquiesce in those things,

things, as the infallible Law of God, which they ſhall judge fit for the getting and maintaining of credit and glory in this world. What elſe can poſſibly provoke theſe men thus to oppoſe the Name of the Lord to the Name of the Lord? Suppoſe equity and Right on the one ſide, which made them aſſert it in the Name of the Lord; there muſt be ſome ſtrong luſt on the other ſide, or elſe they would never have dared to oppoſe the Name of the Lord, and pretend his name too for ſo doing: and what could that luſt be, but that of dominion, arrogance and glory among men? The deciding of ſuch a matter as this man's marriage upon the point controverted between them, could not I think have any other tendency.

14. I have been the longer upon theſe two inſtances becauſe the matter of fact in them is not denyed: now we come to that which is, or rather ſeems to be denyed, or is deceitfully ſo. I mean that relation of a Paper ſent to *Hartford*, mentioned p. 18. In anſwer to which three *Quakers* of *Hartford*, namely *Henry Stout*, *Nicholas Lucas*, *Richard Martin* teſtify that *in God's fear they know of no ſuch Paper, ſo ſigned, or ſent, conſequently there could be no ſuch contents or diſlike:* And they conclude *that five great and manifeſt lyes meet in* thoſe few lines of our Author; 1. *that there was ſuch a Letter*; 2. *that it had that paſſage in it*; 3. *that twelve of the great Ones ſigned it*; 4. *that it was diſliked*; *and laſtly, that he remembers all this.* We ſhall now ſhew the great diſingenuity and deceitfulneſs of this anſwer. For

1ſt, Our Author doth not ſay that *Twelve of the great Ones*, &c. but about a dozen (for they were but eleven, as he ſaith *page the* 30.) And it's not unlikely, they repreſented it thus falſly, that they might with leſs prick of Conſcience deny it. 2dly

2dly. It doth not follow, There were no ſuch Paper, becauſe theſe three men do not know of it. For, 1. it was ſeven years ago, and they might forget that which our Author remembred. 2. I am informed that *Martyn* did not at that time live at *Hartford*, and was not then ſo known in that place as he pretends to be now: and perhaps *Lucas* neither, however his buſineſs abroad might well enough hinder him from ſeeing and knowing of that which others, that were more at home or in Priſon, did both ſee and know: And the like may be ſaid for *Stout*.

3dly. Why did not *Rich. Thomas* alſo teſtifie as much as theſe men? for he both lived at *Hartford* then, and at *London* now. And why did they not ſend to *Hartford*, and have the teſtimony of the moſt part of the known *Quakers* of that time? But theſe men muſt be choſen out, whoſe teſtimony be it true or falſe, doth not at all determine the matter in queſtion.

4thly. That there was ſuch a Paper, that ſuch was the Contents of it; that it was ſigned by Eleven of the great Ones or Elders, is ſo far from being 3 great and manifeſt Lyes, that they are three great and manifeſt Truths: For the *Bookſeller* will produce it upon any juſt occaſion. Neither is the 4th particular a lye, viz. that it was diſliked: For *G. Biſhope* then of *Briſtoll* wrote a large Letter in diſlike of it, which the Bookſeller can alſo produce: and if thoſe things were ſo, it's no great marvel if our Author remember them. So that if there was any miſtake in his relating this matter; 'twas onely of *Hartford* for *Briſtoll*; and this the *Quakers* at *London*; and particularly *Alex. Parker*, *Geo. Whitehead*, *Stephen Criſp*, *&c.* whoſe names are to the Paper, How could they poſſibly

be

be ignorant of it? yet notwithſtanding, * they have the confidence to abuſe the world with a ſeeming denial of the whole matter. But yet there's no reaſon to imagin that the Author was miſtaken, either in that, for the title of the Letter is this: *A Teſtimony from the Brethren, who were met together at London in the third month 1666. to be communicated to the faithful Friends and Elders in the Countries, by them to be read in their ſeveral meetings, and kept as a Teſtimony among them.* Shall we think now that this Letter thus deſigned for the Countries and their ſeveral Meetings, thus authoriz'd by eleven great Elders, and ſent to *Briſtol* 90 miles from *London*, ſhall we think (I ſay) that it was not ſent to *Hartford* diſtant 20 miles? Believe it that will! Perhaps indeed it might meet with oppoſition from the perſons to whoſe hands it firſt came (and that there is ſome cauſe to believe) and ſo might not be communicated to the whole People. But perhaps they take occaſion from ſome miſtaken word in our Authors relation of the Contents, to vilifie and deny the whole. [And indeed I hear that even *H. Stout* being rebuk'd for denying, confeſt the Paper; but ſaid, It was not to that intent as the Author relates] For our Author has told us (p. 22, 23.) and they deny it not, that *to cover the whoredoms of the wanton Miniſtry &c. and unclean Strumpets,* they *did judg openly the miſtake of a Perſon, when the actions were true, and in the ſame houſe.* It ſeems the Relators did truly inform of the man and actions, but miſtook the woman of the houſe for the ſervant, and therefore the teſtimony was made

* *What's become of John Osgood's integrity, that he ſhould put his name among ſuch men as theſe?*

made invalid, the criminals go free, and the poor witneſs condemn'd. O innocent, holy, and harmleſs People!

So I could tell you the eminent *Quakers* name, who to a ſcrupulous man did ſeem to juſtify one of his Brethren in denying to know what he very well knew (when queſtioned by a Magiſtrate,) by this; *he could not tell, becauſe he would not tell*; and he ſaid it was uſual for friends ſo to do: but who would believe it, that even the Body of the *Quakers* in the Paper called, *A Declaration from the People of God called Quakers* (relating to the Act againſt Conventicles) have theſe words? *And as for the word,* [*diſloyal to the King*] *we have always paid our Taxes, and Aſſeſſments, and other dues and duties, more than any people, according to our abilities*; when their Neighbours all over *England* know there are (at leaſt) ſome Taxes or Aſſeſſments, which they have peremptorily refuſed; which thing being objected to *G. Fox*, (who with *G. Whitehead* (they ſay) was the Author of that Declaration,) he anſwer'd, We pay Our Taxes &c. intimating that the term *Our* was not to be extended to the Taxes &c. requir'd, but to thoſe paid. O wonderful equivocation! But when a honeſt-harted woman told him, ſhe paid no Taxes &c. he reply'd, Thy ſalt, and oyl, and vineger in the ſhop do all pay taxes; or to that purpoſe. Behold here the Doctrine and practice of this *true Prophet whom John ſaid he was not*! Behold the Anointed, *whoſe Kingdom is eſtabliſhed in peace*! has come up to the *Jeſuits* already, and how far he will excell them, we know not. But let's return to our Author. The ſubſtance of that Letter, whereof I have given you the title, is this; Theſe Eleven Brethren and Elders, viz. *Rich. Farnſworth,*

Alex.

Alex. Parker, George Whitehead, Joſiah Coale, John Whitehead, Thomas Loe, Stephen Criſp, Tho. Green, John Moon, Tho. Briggs, James Parks, do By the operation of the Spirit of Truth conſider that their Society and Government cannot be kept inviolable againſt their covert enemies [by whom they mean the Hat-men] who are not afraid to ſpeak evil of Dignityes [*G. Fox* and his Adherents] and deſpiſe Government; they therefore do unanimouſly and with the Lords preſence (as they ſay) teſtifie (1) that ſuch as exalt themſelves above the Body of good and antient Friends [*G. Fox &c.*] ought not to have any dominion, office or rule in the Church of Chriſt.

2. That ſuch as are not in unity with the Miniſtry and Body have no Goſpel-Authority to be Judges in the Church, and their judgment ought not to be regarded: that it is abominable pride when any particular will not admit of the judgment of the witneſs of God in Friends [*G. Fox's* and their opinion] to take place againſt him; for he, that is not juſtified by that, is condemned in himſelf and harden'd, [a notorious Heretick.]

3. They teſtifie in the name of the Lord, that the Church has power (without the aſſent of diſſenters) to determine Controverſies, and that ſuch Perſons as will not ſubmit to their judgment conſiſtent with the Doctrine of antient Friends [that is, of *G. Fox* and his Party] but oppoſe it as the judgment of man, ought to be rejected, together with thoſe that countenance and encourage them. They are joyned in one with Heathens and Infidels.

4. That ſuch diſapproved Miniſters ought (what ever have been their gifts) to leave off miniſtring till they are reconciled to the Church: and if approved

perſons

persons degenerate to division, and countenance faction [that is, the Hat-men] the Church has authority to deal with them in the same manner; to which if they submit not, warning ought to be given in General-Meetings to beware of them, and to have no fellowship with them.

5. They warn and charge all Friends, that they have no hand in publishing the Books or Writings of such as are not of unity with the Body; —— and *we farther desire that from time to time faithfull and sound Friends and Brethren* [*G. Fox* and his Party] *may have the view of such things as are printed upon Truths account (as formerly it hath used to be) before they go to the Press.*

6. They advise that such as are made Overseers of the flock of God by the Holy-Spirit ——admit not the weak to that trust; and that none be admitted to order publick business, but those that seek the good of all [that is, submit to the great Body of *G. Fox* and his party]. They conclude thus: So, dear Friends, believing that you will be one with us ——against those who would limit the Lord to speak without Instruments [that is, will obey the Light in themselves, and not be subject to the dictates of *G. Fox* and his party] —— and reject the counsel of the wise men, and the testimony of the *Prophets which gethered you, and would not allow him liberty in and by his Servants to appoint time and place wherein to meet —— and call this

* *For they perceived many of their hearers, wearied and offended with their long preachings &c. would have had them to return home to their Imployments and Callings; but the proud way of living they had betaken themselves to, they were not willing to leave, and therfore strengthen themselves in it by severe Injunctions.*

Formal

Formal, and the Meetings of Man, &c.

15. Now let all conſidering men judg, whether ever ſuch an arrogant, imperious and audacious Paper was given out by ſuch a number of Mortals! The Pope hath never (I think) taken ſo much power to himſelf as to determin matters of this nature and in this manner, but in a General Council, and with their concurrence: but herein theſe men tranſcend him, and all that ever went before them: *That they did owne thoſe men to whom they wrote, to be led and guided, and that they ought in all ſuch matters to be led and guided immediately by the infallible Spirit of God; and they did owne that thoſe againſt whom they wrote had been led and guided by the ſame infallible Spirit, and gave at this time no other evidence of their not being now led by it, but only their diſſent from theſe men in the matters mentioned*: the cheif whereof in particular was, The not putting off the Hat to their prayers; which things conſidered, their giving Charges and Laws in the Name of the Lord to the perſons aforeſaid, is nothing leſs than arrogating a Spiritual and Divine Power over that which they teach, ought to be hearkned to as the Infallible and Divine Spirit, and that in thoſe matters which ſome of themſelves have acknowledged might be otherwiſe ordered by the Holy-Spirit of God. As *John Whitehead* (who is one of them) in the matter of the Hat, in the Paper foremention'd; and *Geo. Whitehead* in that other Paper ſent to *J. Perrot*: And did they not own *John Perrot* for a true Friend? and that he was ſent of God according to their Principles to preach at *Rome*? and did they not own his Sufferings there to be for the Truth? and *Perrot* ſayes in his Paper, *I have received by expreſs commandment from the Lord God of Heaven*

in

in the day of my Captivity in Rome, viz. *to bear a ſure Teſtimony againſt the Cuſtom and Traditions of the taking off of the Hat by men, when they go to pray to God, the which they never had by Commandment from God*: To this agrees what *G. Fox* ſaith in the Book of *True-honour &c.* aforementioned, where he calls *Worſhip with the Hat voluntary Humility and not of command by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.* And muſt now this Revelation to this eminent Prophet and Sufferer given him in his Captivity be deſpiſed and condemned for a deluſion, becauſe it is not approv'd by *George Fox*? muſt the apprehenſion of Scandal bear ſway againſt ſuch a Revelation, amongſt thoſe People, whoſe practice is full of Scandals, and liked the better by them on the account of diſtinguiſhing them from others? Is it not evident enough that the true reaſon of their not receiving his teſtimony was, its contradiction to the practice of *G. Fox*? had it been reveal'd to him firſt, it had been receiv'd readily; but now it muſt be rejected. Here we may perceive clearly, what it is that influences theſe men in the owning or diſowning of Divine Revelations: however there's no gainſaying, but *that notwithſtanding all the advantages that any Ruling Quaker has, he may be groſsly deluded, and take that for an infallible Revelation from God, which proceeds indeed from the ſpirit of deceit.* For thus *Fox* and his party ſay, *Perrot* and his party did; and the like might *Perrot* ſay of *Fox*: And *Fox* or his party cannot give any the leaſt ſolid ground, whereby to decide the Controverſie between them. Therefore we conclude juſtly that theſe men, as Rulers and Prophets, are led by a Self-contradicting, Proud, Blaſphemous and Tyrannical Spirit. For they equally

pretend Revelation, and if there be any advantage in this matter, it is on *Perrot's* ſide and not on *Fox's*; ſo that if *Perrot* be condemned, *Fox* cannot ſtand. That he doth ſtand among the greater number of *Quakers*, proceeds meerly from his Intereſt, Cunning, *&c.* And as the whole party of the Hat-men is to be oppoſed to the whole party of *Foxonians*; ſo in particular *George Biſhop* of *Briſtol* is to be oppoſed to every one of thoſe eleven Miniſters; for he was ſo far from atteſting to their Teſtimony (as every Quaker, had it been true, ought to have done) that he contradicted it, and wrote a large Letter in oppoſition to it; The ſubſtance of which is this, *viz.*

"Having conſidered their Paper in the Spirit of "Truth, he is moved of the Lord to let them know, "1. That it is much, that they ſo few, ſo young, "and ſo very little in compariſon of the Body, or "thoſe whom they count Elders, ſhould take up- "on them to determine in things of ſo high a na- "ture, *&c.* which if they are to be done, ought "to be done by the full conſent of thoſe who are in "Authority in the Church (if ſo be there be ſuch an "Authority ſo to determine) and not by a few, and "thoſe not at all deputed in the thing. If you ſay "(ſaith he) you have not determined ſo as to im- "poſe upon the Body of Friends, but only given "your own judgment in the thing: I anſwer, you "are very poſitive and plain in the determination. [And ſo repeating their Preface, he collects]---which "is in the nature of a Civil Commandment. [Then he recites their firſt particular, and ſayes] —which "is as much as an Inſtitution. [Then of the ſecond Particular he ſaith] —— "which is an Inhibiti- "on. [Of the third Particular he ſaith] —which

is

" is Doctrine. [Of the fourth he ſaith] —which is " Correction. [Of the fifth] —which is Admoniti- " on. [Of the ſixth] —which is Exhortation. [Of the Concluſion he ſaith] — " this is Inſtruction. Next he ſaith, " The Spirit of the Lord in this day, " and in the days of the Apoſtles bears not the ſame " proportion: then were Apoſtles, Paſtors, Teachers, " Elders, &c. but in this day the Spirit it ſelf is Paſtor, " Teacher, Elder, &c. ſo that if the Spirit move any " to declare or ſpeak, that is the Apoſtle, Teacher, " Elder, &c. So that we have not now things in the " diſpoſition of Perſons, but according to the Po- " wer which moves in every one, ſo there is not that " Hazard, as to Apoſtacy, as was in that day — ſo I " know no Paſtor, Teacher, Elder, &c. but as I find " moving in any to any of theſe things; and that, " which would be otherwiſe than this, leaps into " Apoſtacy, and will ſeek to bring in dark night a- " gaine, and will be ſecluding the thing to the per- " ſon, and not the perſon to the thing: and as for my " part, if that day ſhould prevaile, or theſe things " which your Paper ſemes to hold forth and inforce, " I have no other expectation, but that the ſame ex- " erciſe we ſhall receive at your hands — as we " together received from the hands of thoſe who " would have held us in Captivity. 3. The Seed is " come in which the Miniſtry is to end. Now for " you, becauſe you Miniſtred, to think to ſettle your " ſelves in the place of the Heir, and to inforce your " ſtation, — is not to allow that the Seed is come; " and whether your Paper doth not ſo ſpeak, view it " over again, and let that which ſhould, judge in " the matter. — Friends and Brethren, take heed " how you ſet up your Laws and Conſtitutions

"over his dominion —— many have attempted it, "and have been broken to pieces; and if you do the "ſame, the ſame will be your portion from the "hand of the Lord. In the Power you are ſafe, "but when once you go to outward things to pre"ſerve your ſtation, and keep you up, as Papers, "ſtrivings, *&c.* you err ſo much from the Power, "and this will work you down alſo, if you oppoſe "your ſelves againſt his Kingdom. *Briſtol the* 3*d* "*of the* 11 *month*, 1666.

Here we have the infallible Spirit of the Quakers in *G. Bi op* giving judgment againſt the eleven Elders, that they had gone from their Principle into the way of Apoſtacy, and prophefying their downfal. And he that knew *George Biſhop*, or has read his writings, will (I think) find reaſon enough to take his judgment concerning their principles, as ſoon as any or all of the eleven Elders. So that they have not only offer'd this affront to mankind, *viz. That they profeſs in Principles and Practices neceſſary to man's happineſs, to diſtinguiſh themſelves from all other men, and for the truth and certainty of thoſe principles and practices, they bring no evidence, but the inward Teſtimony of the Light in every man, and yet condemn all men as unfaithful to that Light, (how innocent ſoever in their own Conſciences) that are contrary to them, or agree not with them:* which is in effect, to give the lie to every man beſides themſelves, and to ſay, that all the World, except *Quakers*, are lyers; And the thing is true in reſpect of primitive Chriſtianity, (which they pretend to) that it brought ſuch evidence with it to them, to whom it was fully preach'd, that no conſiderate man would

dis-

disbelieve it, but he must be a lyer, and willfully blind. But these men do not only thus affront all mankind that consene not to them, but also they conclude, even all Quakers, (that agree with them in all their Principles and Practices wherein they differ from others) to be self-condemn'd, if they subject not themselves to their Judgment in so small a matter as is the covering or uncovering the Head when others pray, and things of that kind. For I never heard that any Hat-man kept on his Hat when himself prayed, except *Perrot*. And so they contradict in the Name of the Lord, that very voice in men, which they have taught them to give heed to as the voice of the Lord. So when *J. Penyman* carrying all his Books to a Friend of his near the Exchange, was mov'd to burn some waste papers there in his passage, pouring out some Quakers Books, which (he having a little before born Testimony to *G. Fox* and *Whitehead's* face, against their deceitful Declaration, and all other Scurrilous Paper) they were so offended at him for, that *G. Whitehead* next day in a Letter to *J. P.* calls this his undertaking to burn *their Books* [not a word of the Scriptures, as is in their printed Paper, to take with the People] *a mad and wicked action, to which the Divil instigated and led him.* Which Letter he order'd *G. L.* to get from him; afterward when *J. P.* complain'd of the wrong he had in having the Letter taken away from him surreptitiously; *G. Whitehead* reply'd, that he was moved of the Lord to send it, and understanding that it was not receiv'd in the same love in which it was sent, he was also moved of the Lord to send for it again: to which *J. Penyman* reply'd, that he had neither opened nor read

that Letter nor knew from whom it came, till the ſaid *G. L.* came and asked him concerning it. Thus we ſee that *G. Whitehead* could pretend a motion from the Lord, not only to condemn with deteſtation what his Friend was mov'd to, but alſo to ſend one to get away that which was become another mans propriety, and that upon a falſe ſuggeſtion. Moreover, *G. W.* ſaid, *he would not return it, except the Lord requir'd him: What ſtrange Doctrine is this* (replied J. P.) *that thou wilt not return me that which was ſtolen from me, except the Lord require thee?*

XVI. Moreover, let thoſe that have been careful to compare the judgment of the Ruling Elders with the Truth, (in thoſe things that might by future events be diſcerned) tel us whether particular perſons or the Junćto has been more deceived. God in his Providence did (as has been commonly related) for ends beſt known to himſelf, raiſe up among the *Quakers* a man (by name *Thomas Ebbit*) who came out of *Huntington-ſhire* to *London* in great haſte to Propheſie the burning of the City, and arrived here a day or two before that dreadful Fire began: This Man (as I am informed) the Elders, who ſo highly pretend to the diſcerning of Spirits, took unto them, and examin'd him concerning it, and inſtead of approving his Propheſie, they did almoſt perſwade the Man that it was a Deluſion; and ſo in a matter that ſo highly concerned them as well as others, I never could hear that any of them gave credit to him, but were as far from diſcerning Truth in that Word which came to paſs, as any of their Neighbors; and ſuffered equally with them in that general Calamity. And ſo this Propher, who, if they had given heed to him, might have been a great glory to

their party, is the ſhame and reproach of them all to whom his Tidings came, but eſpecially to the Judging Elders. Suppoſing now *G. F.* and his adherents to be the old Prophets (as they would be eſteemed) we ſee by this inſtance, they can contradict the Word of the Lord in the younger Prophets, as did the old Prophet, 1 *Kings* 13. But me-thinks the ſad fate of that young Prophet, for giving heed to the old one, ſhould ſufficiently caution the young Quakers againſt believing the old ones contrary to the Light in their own particulars.

XVII. Having now ſeen *G. Fox's* forgery in the Name of the Lord, and the Elders contradicting the Elders in the ſame Meeting in the Name of the Lord, and the whole Body of *Quakers* divided in the Name of the Lord between the *Foxonians* and the Hat-men; and *G. Biſhop* by the ſame Spirit oppoſing the Eleven Miniſters; Let us now take a view of *Jo. Swinton* oppoſing himſelf in the Name of the Lord. And whereas he ſaith (p. 22.) in extenuation of his fault, in writing that Paper which he is charged with in the Spirit of the Hat p. 34. that *ſoon after he was convinc't* [to be a *Quaker*] *he was ſhut up in a cloſe priſon, and continued a priſoner for divers years, and being at a diſtance and much alone — was betrayed to the writing of that Paper mentioned, and when he came to ſee what he had done by it, he came forth in abſolute judgment againſt that Paper, and the Spirit in which it was writ, and this judgment was not in an hour of Temptation, &c.* So he acknowledges the Truth of what our Author has told concerning him, but he deny's the inference, namely that his Recantation was rather in an hour of Temptation.

If it be true (as true it is) that this recanted Paper

was wrote in *Newgate* 1664; then we may justly complain that this man (who has sometimes born a great place and title) comes far short of that ingenuity that might be expected from him; for *Newgate* was far enough from being a close prison, there being very many of the *Quakers* prisoners with him at the same time; also I find him come to that proficiency in *Quakerism* in the year 1660, that he undertakes to write a Paper directed *To all the Friends to Truth in the Nations*: and he begins thus, *Dear Friends, I am commanded of the Lord God, &c* and in the process, *I speak what in the Infallible I see and know.* This (they say) was written from the *Gatehouse*-Prison: here he tels them, *the enemy hath entred, and I say (in the dread & Authority and Power of the Living God) hath leavened many: and the Seed hath been and is burthened in many particulars, and in one another; The world hath entred, Self hath entred, the high mind hath entred, &c.* In the year 1664, I find another Paper of his, written at *Franly* in *Cheshire* the 27th of the 6th month: And the Recanted Paper called a * Lamentation, *&c.* bears date the third of the ninth Month, which was about ten weeks after: Let the Reader judg, whether his being a close Prisoner, and

* *Therein he writes thus; For Friends in the Name and Authority of the Living and Eternal God — I have seen the Anger, and Fury, the Indignation of the Almighty God ready to break forth into a mighty flame, — yea, and the Leaders, many of them not standing clear herein:* [speaking of outward things] *Is this all? Nay, nay!* Israel's *wound lies deeper, is more Spiritual and inward, and therefore the more incurable: Pride, Conceitedness, High-mindedness, love of Dominion, Selfishness, an Exalted spirit, an Itching mind, to declare words in and above the Seed of the Kingdom, hath deeply entred Israel, yea the Leaders, the Leaders,* &c.

and much alone, and at diſtance, be a righteous excuſe: it's obſervable that in this time of Temptation (as he now calls it) he wrote that which is as likely to have been prophetical as any thing he ever wrote; for in the beginning of the great Sickneſs, which we know was followed by the Fire, he ſaith thus: *O London, London! thy Tryals are but beginning; Theſe are but the beginnings of the evils that are to overtake thee; Deſolation, Deſolation ſhall enter into thy Bowels, yea even into thy very bowels!* 29th *of the month called* July, 1665. Afterward in the year 1668. I find a Paper of his dated 26th of the 6th month, directed to the Mens Meeting, wherein he tells of his coming to *London* the Winter foregoing, and of the conſtructions put upon his 64th Paper, which (ſaith he) *was writ in the expreſs motion of God, and in his manifeſt leadings out of and beyond all thoughts and reaſonings*, &c. *and that upon every recourſe to God, the ſearcher of his heart in that matter, he had always renewed juſtification and acceptation*; Then he gives an account of what paſſed between him and them at a Meeting with the Elders, how they judged his Paper in the Name of the Lord, and would have him to aquieſce in their judgment; that being in his own hired Houſe, it roſe in him to viſit Friends in *London* again; that the Lord was with him as he paſſed in *Northumberland, Biſhoprick, Yorkſhire, Lincolnſhire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Eſſex*. And he concludes thus: *which Paper I am again to acquaint you ſtands juſtified in every tittle of it, and I am plainly to acquaint you, that I cannot retract it, nor the leaſt ſyllable of it; God doth juſtifie me in it, and I ſhould be Rebellious and Treacherous to my Light and Life, if I ſhould retract it or*

any

any ſyllable of it, or deny the Spirit in which it was writ, &c.

Now after all this he retracts it, and denyes the Spirit in which it was writ; whereupon I would ask him; What greater evidence has he of the Spirit of the Lord in his Retractation, than he had in his Aſſertion? However doth he not herein plainly acknowledge that the Spirit of Truth and Light, by which he did profeſs to be led and guided for four or five years together, was the ſpirit of Error and Darkneſs? and that the *Quakers* (notwithſtanding their pretence to Infallibility) are upon their preſent principles incident to Blaſphemy, and that for a long time together? And whether this kind of Blaſphemy be not a deadly ſin? or whether a man may live in it a long time and be in the Favour of God all the while? If *John Swinton* can ſatisfie himſelf in his Retractation, let him not be ſo vain to imagine that he can ſatisfie others that require a reaſon of what they hold. If he would take as much pains with himſelf now as he pretends to have done heretofore, I am perſwaded he might ſee, that the worldly glory of the *Quakers*, and conſequently of himſelf, is the great Argument that ſways with him in his Recantation, for *the Child muſt not be divided, nor the Seamleſs Garment rent*. How great is the modeſty of our Author, that only *appeals to the impartial* in this caſe, *whether this Recantation was not done rather in an hour of Temptation*; and doth not aſſert it abſolutely, having ſuch ſtrong Arguments for ſo doing? But how great the immodeſty of *W. Penn*, to charge that for a Lye, of which himſelf can have but a conjectural knowledge. But what wonder? ſince he ſeems by his late Pamphlets to have abandon'd himſelf,

ſelf, to be *G. Fox's* and the *Quakers* Hector. There was a complaint againſt him of divers Lies, Calumnies, and other abuſes committed by him in his Book intituled, *The Spirit of Truth*, &c. carried to the *Bull and Mouth* to be exhibited to the Body of the *Quakers*, or Mens Meeting, then ſitting there, by about half a ſcore Citizens and others; but they were not admitted — *G. Whitehead* told them, he would ſhew it to *W. Pen*, if they would ſet their hands to it. It ſeems he that comes to King *G. Fox's* Court muſt obſerve the formalities of that Court, and though this complaint has been long in *Stephen Criſp's* hands ſigned according to order, yet no anſwer is return'd, but that he had ſhew'd it to *W. Pen*, and *W. P.* had anſwer'd it in Print; indeed *W. P.* in his *Winding-ſheet*, ſaith, *The Anabaptiſts came to the* Bull and Mouth *to demand judgment againſt* W. P. *about All, for Many, were they not well imploy'd?* What *Pen*! is this the cuſtom of *G. Fox's* Court to jeer the poor Petitioners? to reject their complaint with Scorn, and belie them to boot? For the complaint conſiſted of at leaſt ſixteen particulars, whereof All for Many was but one. The Truth is, I do not ſee how *W. P.* can vindicate himſelf from the Nature and Dignity of a Knight of the Poſt, and conſequently the Title will be his due. Provided always that it be taken for the proper character of a Knight of the Poſt, that he is one that frequently and publickly aſſerts by Oath, that which he either knows to be falſe, or doth not know to be true: And that *G. P's* word publickly given, may (according to the *Quakers* Principle) be taken to have the force (and the falſity in that caſe to deſerve the puniſhment) of an Oath. Beſides that his frequent appeals

to

to God and calling him to witneſs and judge, have the true nature of Oaths, and are ſo eſteem'd by all ſober and intelligent men. Wherefore ſince *W. Pen* loves not that we ſhould call him bare *William*, as the *Quakers* do, but doth almoſt beg his due title of *J. Morſe* (ſee *Plain dealing, p. 7.*) I think it but equal that we call him Mr. *P n.*

XVIII In the next place let us look upon *William Goſnell's* Teſtimony, which in two pages contains ſo much virulent and opprobious language, that I conclude it could not proceed from ſuch a Novice-writer as *W. G.* It looks more like the work of an older proficient in that manner of ſpeaking, and may agree better to *G. W.* than to *W. G.* and that which further induces me to think ſo, is, that the man intended by the *Spirit of the Hat* his name (as I am informed) is not written *Goſnel* as in the Spirit of *Alex.* but *Goſnold*; but whether that be ſo or no, it's not unuſuall with the *Quakers* to give as much credit to one another as is the ſetting their Names to things they know not. Thus *William Sparrow* deſired *William Trevers* and *John Pennyman* to ſign a certificate (of the contents whereof they knew not the truth or falſity) becauſe it was drawn up and approved by *G. Fox, Rich. Hubberthorn, &c.* which *J. P.* refuſing, *Sparrow* was offended at him; and he received a check from *G. Fox*, for adviſing him to caution Friends not to ſubſcribe any thing they were ignorant of, through the eſteem and great confidence they had of his mind to have it ſo, *for* (ſaid *J. P.*) *if they think it to be thy mind to have it done, they will do it, tho' they be ignorant of it themſelves*; to which *Reb. Trevers* (a great Propheteſs among them) agreed, ſaying moreover, *that if ſhe had a motion from the*

the Lord as she believed, yet if he (G. Fox) did not owne it so to be, she should deny it. She further added, *that her Maid should say, Jo. Pennyman was a wise man, and would not subscribe that Paper, else she believed her Master would have done it.* This refusall was so much resented by another of their then chief Ministers, that he told *J. P.* that if he had subscribed the said Certificate, he would have stood betwixt God and him in so doing, alleaging that it was their practice in such cases; yea his and their enmity against *J. Pennyman, J. Osgood* and others (in these days, being about 11 or 12 years since) that oppos'd the irregularities of the 2d dayes Meeting, was so great, he called them a company of base fellow's. These things considered, no marvel if *W. G.* might not give *G. W.* leave to write what he would, and set his name to't

But 3dly, when I first saw *Gosnel's* name in the *Spirit of Alexander*, I expected nothing less than a denyal of what is related to have been said by *G. F.* (Spirit of the Hat, p. 27.) viz. *Friends, altho I have not told it you, I do now declare it, I have Power to bind and to loose whom I please*: but it seems it was true, and how can it be otherwise, that so great a King and Prophet as *G. Fox* should not have such a Power? However this *Gosnel* confesses to have spoken unadvisedly, when he reflected upon the zeal of that man of God, though he had said (as I have heard) when he was desired to go to *G. F.* to be reconciled, &c. *I abhor to prostrate my Reputation at the Feet of any Mortal*: yet before his last going beyond sea, did comply with him, and is now become a Preacher among them.

But let us see what it was that provoked King

George's

George's zeal to such a height, which occasion'd *W. G.* to think he would have struck *S. Newton* ! I understand there was of late a Meeting set up by *G. F.* upon the Account of the *Quakers* sufferings, whence as occasion served they had recourse to the Lawyers for their advise to elude the proceedings of their Procecutors. At one of these Meetings *S. N.* produced *G. Fox's* Book to the Judges and Lawyers against their proceedings, by which he told them they made void the blood of all those that have suffered for conscience sake in those matters ; and also disliked their making use of a *Quaker* as their Solicitor, who was under an ill fame, (see Spirit of Hat p. 42.) but favour'd by *G. Fox* : these things so transported their chief Propher, that *W. G.* thought by his postures and carriage, he would have struck *S. N.* who moreover produced a Letter from *Rob. Duncomb* and *John Jennocks*, relating the Death of one *Rich. White*, who for following their Solicitors advise in these matters (considering the Doctrine and Practice of *G. Fox* himself and the *Quakers*) had upon his death-bed been much wounded in Spirit, and desired *R. D.* to warn Friends how they *went down to Egypt for help*, or went from the Light in themselves to follow the advice of men. Had not *G. F.* the man of God think ye, reason enough to be in a fury at such a bold man as this *S. Newton*, who durst thus shew him his palpable contradiction to himself, and the sad consequence thereof?

Well, But *Gosnel* (what ever becomes of himself) will needs have our Author (among many other great wickednesses) to have brought forth *a Monstrous work, to be irreligious and void both of Conscience and Spirit* : Why so I pray. Why ? because in

in one place he pleads *Conſcience* and *Goſpel-Liberty*, [that is, He will not count himſelf oblig'd to keep off his Hat by vertue of *George's* Law, finding no inward obligation of conſcience ſo to do:] but in another place he ſayth, *He keeps it neither off nor on upon a Religious Account*, tho' the *Foxonians* keep it off upon ſuch an account. This is the monſtrous contradiction found out by this accurate Diſtinguiſher, who if he cannot find a knot in the Bulruſh will be ſure to make one. Why doth he not alſo charge the Apoſtle *Paul* with the like contradiction, for bidding the Chriſtians, *ſtand faſt in the Liberty of Chriſt*, and yet ſaying that *he that regards not the day to the Lord, he doth not regard it*? ſee *Rom.* 14. *Gal.* 4. 1. 1 *Cor.* 8. 9. and ſome made *Conſcience of eating*, &c. and others eat, *asking no queſtion for Conſcience ſake*. Can a man ſtand faſt in the liberty wherewith Chriſt hath made him free, and not upon a Religious account? or eat, or keep a day in aſſertion of that Liberty, and yet not upon a conſcientious account of Chriſt's Liberty? And yet make no conſcience of eating or not eating, but uſe his liberty therein as others did not who abſtained for Conſcience-ſake? I knew a Religious man who always put off his Gloves when he went to Prayer, and no doubt but he did it out of Conſcience, but who of a thouſand did ſo beſides himſelf? And who would have ſubmitted to it, had he impoſed that obſervance? but enough to this impertinent man.

XIX. We come in the laſt place to conſider their vindication of their *Miniſtry* from being *Vicious and Wanton; and that Strumpets are amongſt them. This* W. P. *doth in the Name of the holy God deny*, p. 15. *and defies any man on Earth to prove any part of this*

ungodly

ungodly charge — to so much as belongs to any one person by us (saith he) *accounted of it.* And *John Boulton* and *Samuel Newton declare in the uprightness of their hearts that they know of no such, nor can acknowledge any such to be either of their Ministry or their Body.*

A Man would think now that these Men would not dare thus to appeal to God (which is the highest Testimony that Men can give) but that they know their Testimony to be very true, even infallible; and that our Author is a very wicked man in writing such a charge against them. But have patience Reader, and hear what I say on the Authors behalf.

Forasmuch as *W. P.* exclaims upon us for proof, and promiseth that an hearing shall not be refused, we chalenge them to make choice of six disinterested, judicious, and honest persons, such as we may have no just and reasonable exception against; and we on our part will make choice of the same number, and so qualified, against whom they shall have no just and reasonable exception; to which twelve persons so agreed upon, we will referr the Judgment of this matter of Fact, and all other matters of Fact, wherein you have in your late Pamphlets so horribly cryed out of being belyed and slandered, and of the complaint afore-mentioned: and if in the Judgment of these twelve men we shall be found to have said that in detraction from you, of which we cannot give a sufficient reason, we will then give you such satisfaction as these men shall agree upon; Provided that you also ingage your selves to be subject to the like sentence, if the falure be found in you. And lest it should fall out that we may not agree

in

in the choice of ſuch a number of Perſons, we are willing in caſe of difference about them, to refer the Umpirage to the Lord Mayor of *London*, or any *Alderman* on the Bench, or any one of Twenty Common-Council-men. If you accept theſe terms, ſignifie your mind in writing, and leave it with *Francis Smith* the Bookſeller, and you ſhall find Perſons ready to comply with you. If you do not accept them, I hope no conſiderate man will henceforth ever believe either your word or oath; for ſo I call your appeals to God, your imprecations and curſings.

But that the Reader may not too much wonder at this ſtrange Confidence on both ſides, let him conſider, that their loud denial doth but ſeem to contradict our Author's charge; for he ſpeaks of the time paſt, and they of the time preſent when they wrote; whereby they exclude from being accounted of their Miniſtry, 1. Thoſe that have been found guilty and are diſowned, ſuch as *J. C. D. B. W. W. T. T. T. M.* and others. 2. Thoſe that have been guilty, but are deceaſed. 3. Thoſe that are diſowned by theſe Perſons that write, tho' perhaps they may be owned by other Perſons or Meetings in the Country: For I ſuppoſe that *John Bolton* his keeping on his Hat when *Tho. Salthouſe* pray'd in the Meeting, (after he had committed the offence of being a Witneſs at *John Oſgood's* Wedding) was ſuch a diſowning him that *J. Bolton* would in preſence of God have deny'd him to be of their Miniſtry; and yet at the ſame time he was owned by the multitude. 4. I doubt they exclude alſo thoſe that have ſinned and have been judged by *G. F.* or ſome few, and have own'd their condemnation, and ſo have been par-

don'd. For I hear there is one *W. C.* in *New-England* who was long ago accuſed here in *London*, but either denyed the charge, or through favour or otherwiſe avoided ſentence: but now *G. Fox* writes from *New-England* that *W. C.* owns condemnation. 5. If any error has been found in the evidence, as in the caſe of *Tho. Mur.* who *under pretence of Phyſick or Chirurgery, made it his common practice to commit Uncleanneſs, and was employed by G. Fox to judg Perſons and Meetings, &c.* (See Spirit of Hat, p. 31.) Here the miſtake of the Miſtreſs for the Maid (though the man was guilty) got him rather juſtification, and the reporters condemnation as aboveſaid. Now I ſuppoſe that in ſuch a caſe as this, ſuch a Miniſter will be deny'd by them to be guilty till further evidence appear; and when ſuch evidence that cannot be evaded doth appear, then he ſhall perhaps be judged and diſown'd privately, and ſo not of their Miniſtry. 6. The ſcandalous familiarity of the Prophets and Propheteſſes, or Miſtreſſes before marriage, muſt go for nothing, that is, muſt have no force to prove matter of viciouſneſs in their Miniſtry: Now this is the caſe of a great Man among them and his Lady, concerning whom *M. T.* informs *that M. B'. ſaid ſhe was grieved and burthen'd at her heart*, by reaſon that *M. B.* her Brother had reprov'd ſome ſecreſies between thoſe two, fearing leſt they ſhould become publick to the World to diſhonour Truth.

Theſe things conſidered, how wary are theſe men in their challenge? and how do they prevaricate with God and men in their appeal? Allow us the equity you deſire, let the *Quakers* Informations by word or writing be taken as proof upon Oath; and let the ſolemn Teſtimony of others have the force of

ſolid

ſolid Evidence; let thoſe that have declared and prayed amongſt you with tokens of Approbation, be accounted to have been, or to be of your Miniſtry, and then let us go to tryal. In the mean time let me tell you, we have ſeen, and could make publick the information of *M. T.* wherein many of your Friends, and four or five of your Miniſtry, were concern'd; and whereby their names would be ſufficiently expoſed; but it is ſo full of obſcenity and abominable prophaneneſs, that love to the profeſſion of Religion, and charity to the World, and Perſonal modeſty forbid its Publication. And we have ſeen in *Andrew Robeſon's* Anſwer to *Jaſper Bat* and *John Graves* Letter, (to *John Swinton*) their words; *What was it in that Paper chiefly hath given you offence? was it the intimation that many of the Leaders of Iſrael are ſo inclin'd, and had a tendency to draw back into the fleſh-potts of Egypt again? which you call lyes* and *ſlanders: if ſuch things be lyes, what meanes theſe frequent and abominable Whoredoms that ſome are run into, &c.* — and in the cloſe he writes particularly to *J. Gr.* ſaying, *How contrary is this thy work to the private diſcourſes betwixt thee and me, even now in London not a week before this, — were not thy very words, ALL OUR MINISTERS ARE WRONG, &c. 18th of the 5th Month, 1668.* And notwithſtanding *John Bolton's* ſeeming denyal, *&c.* yet he hath ſince acknowledged that he had by him the confeſſion of the two women chiefly concern'd in the ſaid information, whereof our Author has made mention p. 43. We could name ſeveral of your body, (notwithſtanding your impudent denyal of it) ſome that have had Meetings frequently at their houſes, and others, great ſufferers for your cauſe, that have

been detected of whoredom or uncleanness.

T. Rawl. for a long time *G. Fox's* companion, was at length detected of great wantonness toward the Maids. We may observe here that *W. P.* saith, *an hearing against any of them shall never be refus'd*: and that our Author doth wickedly distinguish, when he saith p. 29. *If any of the Ministers commit a fault, their Peers or Equals are only to be their Judges, and not the Laity.* And yet that is so far true, that those words, or to that effect, were spoken by famous *S. Eccles* upon occasion of *W. Mucklow's* offering to be at the Hearing of *John Whitehead* upon an information of wantonness committed by him, concerning which *W. M.* could say something, but was rejected for the reason aforesaid. And *John Harwood* (formerly one of their Ministers, and whilst such, found guilty of notorious uncleanness) falling out with *G. Fox*, accus'd him of divers matters; but could not obtain a Hearing; and thereupon publish'd his charge in print. And when *W. M.* accus'd *G. Fox* to be a respecter of Persons in judgment, tho' divers confess'd the charge was true, yet none had the courage at the Meeting to take his part: but woes and curses were pronounc'd against him by the Grandees, for accusing an Elder. So, when (at an extraordinary Meeting after the great plague) *E. Barns*, as the Ministers were exalting themselves, cry'd out while *R. Farnsworth* was preaching, *You have whored from the Lord. Farnsworth* reply'd, Thou art a whore [or the whore]: whereupon *M. Stancliff* said softly, *An unsavory word*; The next second-day Meeting, *M. St.* being greived in Spirit, complain'd of the carriage of the said Meeting, where he expected humiliation rather than exaltation: but they (in stead of hearkening to him) h

vin

ing notice of that word *unſavoury*, judged him, and caſt him out for that, as they ſaid in their Letter of Excommunication (ſubſcribed by *A. Stodart*, *T. Coveney*, *J. Elſon*, *G. Laytee*) he had called *the Spirit of Truth an unſavoury Spirit*. Thus was this man of known honeſty caſt out for appearing againſt the Miniſtry. But if you would have your Miniſtry fully vindicated as to this matter, provoke *Mr. Hicks* to give you the particulars of that general ſugeſtion of your viciouſneſs, mentioned in the end of his *Continuation*, *&c.* and then clear your ſelves of it if you can.

XX. Thus I have conſidered the Teſtimony which they ſeverally give of their own Innocency and the Innocency of their Body, which I know not what People in the world would have had the face to call them by that title except the *Foxonians*. Now becauſe I have in theſe Papers ſometimes uſed that denomination to thoſe people, and alſo called *G. Fox* by the title of *King*, tho the reaſon of theſe titles is evident enough to him that takes notice of *J. Coals* Letter, yet leſt to the unwary Reader I may be thought to have done this ſlightly, I will conſider his Teſtimony more fully. 1. The Letter comes from *Joſiah Coal*, a mighty man in their eſteem both in his Life and at his Death, for the Narrative of his Life and Death was Printed for his greater Glory. 2. This Letter was approved of, not only by *G. Fox* himſelf, but alſo by his Peers the Elders, among whom no doubt but it was read, and by their concurrence ordered to be Regiſtred among things worthy to be Recorded, and there put in the very firſt place, tho' it hath not the oldeſt date, or elſe why ſhould it be put there at all? It cannot be imagined that ſuch a thing could be done without the

Elders their either explicit or implicit concurrence. So then what is attributed to *G. Fox* by *J. C.* is approved by *George* himself, and the select Elders at least.

As for the Contents of this Testimony. 1. He doth expresly ascribe to him a Kingdom, saying to him, *THY KINGDOM*, &c. and *Thou rules and governs:* now he that rules and governs in his own Kingdom must of necessity be an *actual King*. 2. He describes to us the subjects of this Kingdom; who are nextly *Jos. Coal*, and the Elders or Peers, whom he calls [*us thy children*] & remotely those *to whom the Life of G. F. hath reached through the Elders to the begetting of them again to a lively hope*, and they are said to be *MANY*, by reason whereof he calls him the *Father of many Nations*. 3. He tells us what kind of power and authority it is, in which this King rules and governs, and that is, *the Power of the Highest*; a Spiritual and Divine power, not like that of the Kingdoms of men. 4. We have here the stability of this Kingdom, *Thy Kingdom is establish'd in peace*. 5. The extent of it, *The encrease thereof is WITHOUT END*: It's a boundless Kingdom. And 6. The glory of this King is such

They are the same that are given to King Jesus our Saviour, and agree to him onely. See Isa. 9. 7. *Of the encrease of his Government and Peace there shall be no end; upon the Throne of David and upon his Kingdom to order and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from hence forth even for ever.* Luk. 1. 33. *and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end,* Isa. 9. 6. *Everlasting Father,* or, *the Father of the age to come,* as the Septuagint and the old Latin have it. Heb. 2. 13. *Behold I and the children which God hath given me.* Micah 5. 4. *And he shall stand* and *feed* [or rule] *in the strength of the Lord,* &c. *he shall be great to the ends of the earth.*

ſuch, that not onely the preſent Age, but *Generations to come ſhall call him Bleſſed.*

XXI. Henceforth I ſee not with what face they can blame any man for calling *G. Fox King* of *the Quakers*, (and that in the ſame ſenſe as Jeſus (that was dead) is the King of Chriſtians :) and the Elders among them, *his Children or Princes*, in the like ſpiritual ſenſe; and ſo Peers of the Kingdom: and all the other *Quakers* that adhere to them, *Subjects of his Kingdom:* for theſe denominations are moſt firmly built upon that Doctrine which themſelves approve. And ſo it's no marvel that they proceed againſt thoſe among themſelves, that will not ſubject themſelves to his conſtitutions, as againſt Rebels and Apoſtates. As for others that have not at all ſubmitted to his Government, which they preach up under the terms of *the Light, Chriſt in man, Chriſt the Light, The Seed, A meaſure of Chriſt, The Spirit, The Infallible Guide*, &c. They account them *diſobedient perſons, haters of the Light*, Such as love darkneſs *rather than Light, Of the World that lies in wickedneſs, Infidels*, &c. As *Muggleton* accounts them unbelievers and reprobate perſons that do not believe him to be the great Prophet; ſo do the *Quakers* thoſe that ſubmit not to *G. Fox*, but under the ſpecious names aforeſaid: but they give as much ſpecial evidence of their being ſent of God one as another. They appeal to the Light in us; and when we condemn them upon moſt mature conſideration, they rail againſt us as partial Judges; *W. Pen* doth

By this we ſee that W. Pen *did not ſpeak unadviſedly, when he writes of his Membership in the* Quakers-body, *that* it is an honour more deſirable than to be a companion of Kings.

professedly number all that oppose them among Infidels, or worse, and denyes them the Priviledges of Believers; Nay, for ought I see he counts all of us that are married, *Rogues*, our Wives *Whores*, and our Children *Bastards*; for he will not call *John Pennymans* Wife by his name, but by her Widow's name, consequently she is a Whore, and her Child a Bastard, for all honest Women among us are called by their Husbands names. If he say *John Pennyman* was not married according to the Law of the Land; that exception will be as strong against himself, who has had a Child by one, to whom he was never so married. Therefore the true reason of his abusing *John Pennyman* and his Wife must be, because they were not married in the way of the *Quakers*; and the same reason is full as strong against all that are not subjects of *G. Fox's* Kingdom. Consequently he would call all our Wives by their former names, if he durst: And *W. P.* is not singular in this matter, for other Foxonians have done the like in their Writings: so that it is matter of Judgment, not only of special malice, though perhaps it may be imputed to that cause, that he so describes *John Pennyman's* Wife her inner apparel, as if he were as intimate with her as he is said to be with *Gulielma Mar*—— But *M. Pennyman* is better known and reputed for an honest Woman than *W. P.* is for a Man.

But what occasion did our Author give why *W. Pen* should fall so foul upon *John Pennyman*, and especially upon his Wife? A Woman who hath deeply suffered for their sakes, and faithfully served them *for many years in what soever her hand found to do*, (as she saith of her self in her Printed Postscript,

(a

(a ſad rebuke to *W. Pen*) the Author doth not mention her, nor is there any one paſſage (that I know of) that relates to her; and that which he doth ſay of her comes in by head and ſhoulders. *The Quaker-Miniſters have changed that mean and plain habit in which they came forth at firſt, into rich and fine clothing*, ſaith the Author: *He cries out againſt our Miniſters decent and clean apparel*, (as if rich and fine, decent and clean were all one) ſaith *Pen*) which is *but a better ſort of cover for his own ruſty Garb*. Who ever thought to hear a Quaker blaming a Quaker for his mean Apparel? Then he ſuggeſts that againſt him, which I'm confident is the caſe of many among them, viz. *That the Quakers mean Cloaths made up much of his convincement at firſt*: but then immediately and on the contrary derides *John Pennyman* and *Mary* his Wife for her *Farrendine Gown and Sattin Bodice*. Thus he lays about him like a madman; The Author has vext him, and he wrecks his fury upon *M. Pennyman*: We may ſee what a kind of Gentleman he is: a true Knight would have ſpared a Woman that gave him no offence, and not have ſtript her to her Bodice, and expoſed her in the open ſtreets with her Name and Crime in her forehead: but all this is ſutable to a Peer of *G. Fox's* Kingdom.

XXII. But as for *J. Pennyman*, he is one who for many years has had his Soul vext by ſeeing and hearing the things complained of by our Author, and ſuch like, inſomuch that he has often bore Teſtimony againſt them; and therefore they conclude him of the ſame ſpirit with the Author, which was ſufficient to entitle him to all the reproach they could caſt upon him, which dealing of theirs with their ſhame-

ful

ful covering or denying the matters objected, and bold challenge to make them good, fell out to the advantage of our Authors Letter, for thereupon *May* 30 1673, *J. Pennyman* went to the Quakers Meeting in *Grace-Church-street*, and there openly declares "that "though he was wholly ignorant of either the writ- "ing or printing of *the Spirit of the Hat*, yet know- "ing many of the matters therein inserted to be true, "he was willing to give *John Osgood* (who knew "them as well as himself) and others a private meet- "ing to manifest the same, and also many other "matters of as high concern and of as great wicked- "ness, which (saith he) for about these thirteen "years my self with several others in those dayes "bore a faithful Testimony against: The next day *W. Pen*, *J. Osgood*, *J. Claypool*, and *W. Brend* came to his house and demanded of him to give them a particular charge,* which he soon drew up and sent to *W. Pen*, containing twenty four particulars, many of which are intimated in these Papers. (The 23d against *George Fox* discovers his hypocrisie and dawbing, which we publish not, as *W. P.* doth any base Insinuation, that may make his adversary obnoxious to the Government) To which *W. Pen*, according to his wonted modesty, replyes, that *they wondred to see so empty an Account, after so great a charge publickly exhibited; that they had agreed among themselves, that before they proceeded to a meeting, he should let them know, if this were all he intended to insist upon, and if the issue of that Tryal should be the decision of the con-*

* *They would not grant* John Whitehouse *a coppy of his charge, which* John Boulton *and others had drawn up against him.*

controverſy between them, they would not have their charge piece-meal — with more to that purpoſe. To which *J. P.* returns, that he had done enough at preſent. Thus theſe great Champions evade the anſwering of this fair Challenge. And now, though our Author's name doth not appear, yet we have that which gives more vallidity to his Work, the publick atteſtation of a credible perſon perſonally given: For names to Books have been not ſeldom forged; and who knows whether *W. Penn* will publickly atteſt to all thoſe Pamphlets, and things in them, that are printed with his name? If he will, then let him hear what a judicious Country-Gentleman writes to his Friend upon the reading of *The Spirit of Alexander*, and *the Winding-ſheet*. W. P's *words of* J. P. *are more ſcornful, than can beſeem any pretender to ſobriety: His ſtomack is neither nice nor ſqueamiſh: He can (I ſee) talk at the rate of a Coffee-houſe Pamphleteer, and account it a piece of high ſelf-denial to ſet his name to his jerking anſwers.* This man is more mild than that learned and conſcientious man who upon the reading of his *Winding-ſheet*, gives him in his Letter the title of Buffoon, and much more of that import, which I do not remember.

VV. P. His treating of *J. P.* and his Wife in this manner puts me in mind of his calling it *a horrid lye, that they with the* Papiſts *prefer a looſe perſon before a Non-conformiſt*: *p.* 15. for what are *J. P.* and his Wife, our Author and the other ingenious Quakers (whom they call Hat-men) any other but Nonconformiſts? whom yet he treats as Apoſtates, the worſt of men: ſo that his anſwer to that charge which he calls a horrid lie, proves it a clear truth,

if

if there were nothing elſe (as there wants not enough) to bear evidence.

XXIII. Now for concluſion to this very unpleaſent work, (which the benefit I hope many will reap from it, has put me upon) I ſhall further alledg ſeveral teſtimonyes, both out of *G. Fox*, *VV. Pen* himſelf, and divers other of their approved men, againſt *the honour and reverence of the* Hat, which now they impoſe, upon peril of all ſacred and civil priviledges that are in their power to deprive their people of.

King G. Fox. *True Honour among the Jews.*

P. 8. *The Honour and Worſhip with the Hat, and that humility (ſo called) is voluntary, and voluntary humility, and not of command by Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, &c.

P. 11. *For the Hat is an earthly thing, and a thing below; and they that trouble, fine, impriſon about it, cannot chuſe but mind earthly things, and mind things below, and circumſtances, and cuſtoms, and faſhions of the world, and feigned humility in which there is no ſubſtance, which is below the Royal Seed, and the nobility and dignity of a man, and the honour above, and the Worſhip of God, and the true humility which goes before true honour that is above.*

P. 13. *Now is not Chriſtians worſe then theſe---who make ſuch a work and adoe about putting off their Hats, which are for the covering their nakedneſs? But the true* Jews *would not put off their Hats in the Synagogue, nor in the Temple*, &c.

1653.

1653. *G. Fox* and *Rich. Hubberthorns* Reply to the Northern Miniſters, in a Book called *Truths Defence*, &c.

P. 22. *And when you read them* [the Pſalms] *Hats you keep on, and when you ſing them Hats you put off, and here you worſhip the works of your own hands*, &c.

1653. *G. Fox* in a Book called *Several Papers*, &c.

P. 5. *And when they read the Pſalms, they keep on their Hats; and when they ſing them, they keep off their Hats; here they worſhip the work of their own hands: all ſuch practices we deny.*

About 1659, *G. Fox* To the Judges and Lawyers.

P. 10. *Now the Hat-Worſhip, that Honour, that Idol is ſet up by tranſgreſſors, but men that be in the Law of God which is over tranſgreſſion* —— *they mind not the Hat.*

P. 25 *Now puting off the Hat is but a cuſtom got up among the Chriſtians ſince the Apoſtles in the Apoſtacy, a vain cuſtom ſet up by traditions, which is a worſhip of Men and of the Beaſt, and honour below, and an Idol ſet up by Tranſgreſſors.*

P. 27. *O what a covering of darkneſs is got over you!* [ſpeaking of the then Miniſtry, &c.] *and of prejudice and hardneſs of heart and wickedneſs, that now in the Ancient of dayes, a Hat makes ſuch work with you?*

W. Pen

W. Pen. No Croſs no Crown, P. 7, 8.

Sixteen Reaſons why Cap-honour and titular reſpects are neither honour nor reſpects.

Reaſ. 1. *Becauſe — if true honour conſiſts in Hats, Bows, or Titles, then are the moſt prophane and deboiſt the moſt civil, ſince moſt expert in thoſe vain Ceremonies, which is impoſſible.* Pſal. 50. 23. Iſa. 33. 15.

Reaſ. 2. *Becauſe real Honour is a ſubſtantial thing manifeſted by obedience, which therefore cannot ſtand in invented geſtures — which it muſt neceſſarily do in caſe the ceremony of the Hat be an honour or reſpect.*

Reaſ. 4. *Becauſe honour properly aſcends, not deſcends, yet the Hat is near as frequently off to equals and inferiors, as to ſuperiors.*

Reaſ. 5. *If pulling off a Hat, or Title, were to pay honour, who ſo vile — that could not honour? but this is to make Honour (as ſuperſtitious men do Religion) to conſiſt in ſome external appearances,* &c.

Read more in his Book, which for brevity ſake I may not tranſcribe.

J. Naylor, *concerning Worſhip, Printed about 1656. God is a Spirit, and in Spirit is he worſhiped, not with Mens hands, not with bodily exerciſe, farther then by the eternal Spirit the body is exerciſed: ſo the imaginations, thinkings, and conceivings are ſhut out; all mans ways, mans times and forms, mans decency and orders are all ſhut out, and condemned with the Spirit in which God alone is worſhiped.*

Now I ſhall produce the Judgment of eminent men among the *Quakers* concerning the very controverſy about the Hat, after it was commenc't among them.

Iſaac

Iſaac Pennington. Some Queries in the power and drawings of the Spirit of the Lord, &c.

Quer. 1. *Whether this preſent miniſtration of life doth not point men to an inward principle there to wait for the Teachings of Gods Spirit within, and not to go forth into reaſonings about things (either from Scriptures or otherwiſe) after the manner of men?*

Quer. 2. *Whether thoſe whom the Lord made uſe of to direct to this principle, did then tell us that when we were turned thereto, we muſt obſerve what comely orders were preſcribed by the Apoſtles in the Churches, and that they preſcribed them by the Spirit of God; and that if we were not found in the ſame comely orders, we were not led by the Spirit of God; or did they not rather tell us, that the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles were writ to the then preſent ſtate of the Churches, and that we were not to take up the ſame practices unleſs we were led thereunto by the ſame Spirit?*

Quer. 3. *Is the putting off or keeping on the Hat in Prayer a thing of ſuch a nature, for the Spirit of the Lord ſo to be limitted about, as that he ſhall not, &c. — may not the Spirit of the Lord in ſome of his choſen veſſels teſtify againſt it? Oh let God alone reign in Iſrael!*

To this 3d Query *G. Whitehead* anſwers—the 5th of the 4th month 1663. *This is an unreaſonable and impertinent Query, eſpecially as it is to us who are in the Miniſtry, for we never went about to limit the Spirit of the Lord, in putting off or keeping on the Hat in Prayer*, &c. Will he now dare to diſown and puniſh men for that practice, which he acknowledges they may be moved to by the Spirit of the Lord? O ſtrange!

Quer. 4. *If this be*

brought

brought in as a comly order, is there not equal ground for bringing in all other things which the Apostles prescribed in those days to the Churches, as comly orders also, and so setting up the outward Court again, which the Spirit of the Lord left out in the measuring of his Temple, and withdrew from?

Qu. 5. *Is not this the direct way to draw the mind into reasonings about Scriptures, and from a simple waiting on the principle of Life, where the true peace and unity alone is preserved, and so necessarily a begetting into separation and division? for it is not at this day different practices that divide, but a departing from the principle, and a propagating of unity by reasonings and considerations about things, where it is easy to err and run into uncertainties, and mist of the principle of life and its leadings, which (if the Lord suffer it to prevail) will bring that desolation and reproach upon Israel, which the enemy otherwise never could.*

Thus far *Isaac P.* who surely is a man as able to give an account of the *Quakers* principle as *W. Pen* the *Novice* in that way. If it be said that *Isaac P.* is of another mind now; that makes for us and not against us: for if he was for many years before a true *Quaker* and a great and approv'd Writer for that way of infallibility, and then for some years after profess'd that, as their principle and doctrine, which he afterward recants; doth he not evidently give the lye to himself and doctrine? Can the Spirit of God teach a man for seven years together that he ought to keep off his Hat at Prayer, and then for the next seven years teach him that he may keep it on sometimes, and testify against the constant keeping it off, and after that testify against that Testimony? what blas-

blaſphemy would it be to aſſert this? And yet this is *Iſaac P's* caſe. Would to God he, and they that are concerned with him, would ſeriouſly conſider what firmer grounds he has in ſuch matters to believe himſelf infallible at one time more than at another? If it muſt be reſolved by the judgment of the Body, then for ever give over the Doctrine of Infallible Teachings in particular perſons; and betake your ſelves to the Church of *Rome*, whoſe Characteriſtick Doctrin that is. But if every particular perſon is fallible, whereon ſhall the Infallibility of the Body be grounded? but to proceed to ſome other of theſe infallible Teachers.

John Crook the 22d of the 12th Mon. 1662.

About Meats, and Drinks, Geſtures, and Poſtures, Habits, Times, and Places.

Dearly Beloved Friends — Meats are for the belly and the belly for Meats: the head is for the hat, and the hat for the head, but God will deſtroy and lay all theſe in the duſt. Know your liberty therefore as to theſe things in the Lord, as things below the life into which you are called; onely uſe it not for a Cloak, for envy or diſcord: for as we read of Cain and Abel, two men performing the ſame action, attended with the ſame circumſtances of occurrences and formalities, and yet the one accepted and the other rejected; In like manner may two perſons be found in contrary actions, poſtures or geſtures, and yet both accepted of God. — For if I ſhould lay a bond upon my ſelf therein, I tranſgreſs the liberty of the Spirit, either as to time, conſtancy or place: or if another ſhould lay a bond upon me, or put a

yoak about the neck of the disciples, this is no more justifiable than the former, &c.

We find *John Crook* and *Edward Burrough* also (a man great without controul) joyning in a Letter with *John Perrot* (the Head of the Hat-men) and professing their unity with him long after he had declared himself in the matter of the Hat.

Thus they write: *We are here* [*Newgate prison*] *kept close prisoners, but the blessed presence of the Lord is with us, and we are all in dear love and perfect unity, and our souls do rejoice in the fellowship with God, and one with another, in his love and life: and the Lord hath knit our hearts together in the happy unity, and the contrary is judged, and life and power reigns over all, Blessed for ever.*

About the year 1662.

Edward Burrough.
John Crook.
John Perrot.

XXIV. In the last place I shall alledge the Testimony of *Benj. Furly* (a man of parts) concerning this controversy of the Hat, as I find it given in a shorter abstract of a large Paper wrote by him in behalf of himself and the *Quakers* in *Holland*, Dated from *Rotterdam* about the year 1663, and addrest to *George Whitehead*: which tho' it is larger than might fit this Discourse, yet I hope will recompence the Reader by a clearer state of the controversy among them.

It

It runs thus:

George Whitehead,

THy Paper, *&c.* I receiv'd, and indeed cannot but admire at thy proceeding therein and dealing with me in that politick manner; but ſimplicity and innocency had better become thee and the profeſſion of the Miniſtry of Chriſt, and will alwayes be found the beſt Weapons and Armor; but thoſe that have neither Truth nor Right with them in their plea, muſt needs uſe ſuch weapons as are moſt ſuitable to their evil cauſe, and by which Truth hath alwaies been oppoſed, and the profeſſors thereof perſecuted: for verily, to my grief, I find thee in this thing walking in the too too plain footſteps of all the falſe prophets that ever got up into a carnal Authority, *viz.* to cloath the innocent and harmleſs ſheep in the skin of a wolfe, or ſome other ravenous beaſt, and then all will be out of love with them at firſt ſight; the ſheep will ſhun and avoid them, and the dogs run upon and tear and worry them. Thus thou haſt done whether ſimply or ſubtily, the Lord will judge; but thou haſt put me on the Garments of oppoſition, impoſition, *&c.* yea of oppoſition againſt ſuch as in the freedom or motion of the Spirit of Life do put off their Hats in Paryer; which thing is far from mee, and that which I ſhall, as the Lord gives me opportunity and freedom, bear my teſtimony againſt in any perſon whatſoever.—— And the Paper which I wrote ſpeaks no ſuch thing as thou wouldeſt impute to it, it ſpeaks not in the leaſt againſt any thing which any man is moved to from the Lord, nor againſt any man for doing as he is moved; nay, though he ſhould, but ſo think and be miſtaken in his thoughts, I would not have him leave it till he ſees better. But I do only caution ſuch as do practiſe

ctiſe it without any other ground in themſelves, as to the thing it ſelf, as to that groundleſs one of doing it becauſe others do it, and becauſe it hath been our cuſtom and order ſo many years, *&c.* —— And ſeeing ſuch a Paper come forth from *G. F.* ſo harſhly and perverſly judging all about it *as being entred into the Ranters principle* (though we hate it as much as he can) *and calling it a comely order*, &c. *to be out of which was a token of being out of the Spirit in which the Apoſtle did worſhip God.* And knowing further that *G. F.* did as much break one part of that order (ſo called) in propheſying covered, and others with praying with Caps on their heads, for the Apoſtle ſaith every man that prayeth or propheſyeth (and *G. F.* in his Paper to the *Dutchmen* addeth, or ſpeaketh) having any thing upon his head, diſhonoureth his head. I ſay, knowing and ſeeing this, I could not but lay theſe things before Friends, that they might not be deceived, by the example or authority of any man. —— But if any liſt to be contentious about it, and tells it is a comely order, and I muſt put off my Hat, or by him be judged to be out of the Spirit of God, *&c.* I ſhall rather chuſe to undergo his falſe judgment then defile my conſcience by any piece of will-worſhip which the Lord requires not of me——and tell him or them that the Church of God hath no ſuch cuſtom as to contend or impoſe in ſuch maters, but hath in this taught us, and that truly, that every member is to be guided by the meaſure of Life——in which alone the true unity and good order is.

And I am fully perſwaded of this, that if ever any ſeparation be, it will be through thy and ſome others Lording, rigid driving Spirits, —— yet I cannot but

but caution thee and all Friends, to keep to the motion of the Spirit of God in all things, and to act nothing by cuſtom, upon the account of being his People or the true Church, *&c.* For who or what made us to differ? and if we go without that, wherein do we again differ from others? *and he can ſoon call them his people, and make them a people that are no people.*

For it is not lawful for any man, or company of men, becauſe he or they are in the Spirit of God, and of the true Church, to do, or agree to do what they pleaſe, nor to make, appoint, preſcribe rules and orders for themſelves and all other the members of the ſame body, how or in what manner they ſhall worſhip God, and then walk in thoſe rules, whether the Lord leads them into them or no:— But if he or they ſhall go and do that which the Spirit and Life doth not require of him, it ſhall be ſaid unto him or them, who hath required this thing at your hands: And therefore very unreaſonable & contrary to the known grounds and principles of truth is thy Query to us,—— viz. *Wherefore we do not go into the world and ſhew our teſtimony and ſign againſt them in their Steeple-Houſes.* For we can as little go into any of the Steeple-Houſes to be a ſign againſt them, as we can be conformable to any practice which ſome Friends may uſe— unleſs it be required of us. No manner of worſhip being true or performed aright further then it is performed in the guidings, leadings and motions of the Spirit both as to matter, manner, form and order.

And for thy ſaying, what do I know *but the Lord may require the putting off the Hat now as he did Moſes to put off his ſhoe?* I ſay, I limit not the Lord, nor diſwade any from obeying him, nor yet to leave this thing, that do but think it is required of them, but

what is this to them that know the Lord doth not require it of them? And tho' thou shouldest this day feel the Lord certainly leading thee to it, what's that to thee to morrow, unless thou hast the same motion then also? yea if a man should have found the Lord leading him ninety and nine times to a thing, if he should do it once more in his own will, that once will be found to be will-worship and voluntary humility, *&c.* —— for he is as much an Idolator that goes before the power, as he that draws back or stayes behind is disobedient. Therefore beware what thou dost thy self, and how thou leadest others to act blindly without their owne guide. Thou sayest I accuse *G. F.* for being of another mind than he was six or seven years ago; but thou dost abuse me in so saying: for I neither say nor can believe that he is really of another mind, but that he is to this day, and thou also of the mind (tho' ye unrighteously detain or conceal the Truth) that it is neither sin against nor dishonour to God for a man publickly to Pray with his Hat on, which both his and thy practice so long since (and still in propheſying so) doth evidently shew. But when a man gives himself to partiality, to justify an unrighteous & condemn a righteous thing, what confusion is he not subject to utter, and what pitiful stuff wil he not bring forth, as is this thy fond argument, viz. *that the outward head must be uncover'd, because all things are naked and bare before the Lord*; and thy silly (or worse) comparing *the Elders casting down their Crowns before the Throne of God to worship, with mens doffing their Hats to Pray*; but surely thou art not so weak as thou seemest, nor dost in thy conscience believe, that they did then doff their Hats, nor yet that those Crowns were any visible Materi-

alls;

alls: and yet very frivolously sayst, *this was no Romish Tradition.* O *George*! why doest thou thus dally in these matters? may not doffing the Hat as a peece of reverence and worship of God, be a Romish Tradition, though that was none? May not a man doff his Hat to Pray, and yet keep his Crown and not cast it down before the throne of God? and may he not wear his Hat in Prayer, and yet cast down his Crown as the Elders did? *&c.* I fear this strife is more for Mastery and the Crown than for the thing it self; and in Christ and his Worship no bodily service of any member availeth any thing, but a new creature; neither any covering is to be heeded, but that of the new man.

But if thou judgest us in this thing as weak children, bear with us as such, and abuse us not, neither insult over us, as being gotten up above us *into the state of Christ who never fell, and beyond the state of Adam before he fell*; and withal beware of thinking so of thy self, — for this work of thine apparently comes from self, and exalted above judgment, which God will bring down.

Thy true Friend *Benjamin Furly.*

Now I heartily beg it of the *Quakers* that they would seriously lay it to heart, *How they can be assured of any motion or immediate revelation from God, concerning any matter of belief or practice, (not determinable without such revelation,) so as to judge another person thereabout?* Since they find such palpable and acknowledg'd contradictions in those things, both to one another and to themselves, in the very chief men of their party. And I am perswaded that all that know them will acknowledg that the Hat-men, and those that consented with them, were far more considerable for abilities and endowments of every kind, than any the like number of Foxonians. For my part I wonder much what account those that are fallen from their Principles among these, can give of their

so

so doing, either to God or men. Indeed it's matter of wonder, that any conscientious and sober man or woman, should yet adhere to a Body of People, whose Leaders are detected of such gross Contradictions and Enormities as these we have been treating of.

THE END.

Here follows a Copy of *George Fox*'s ORDER touching the Slit in the Waistcoat, &c. mentioned pag. 11.

ALL Friends every where on your Signs set not up the image and likeness of any Creature in Heaven or in Earth, but by the power of the Lord keep down all the makers of such things; for the ground of them is from the Heathen: But set up a Bed-staff, Fire-shovel, Saw, Fork, Compasses, Andirons, Harrow, Plow, *or any such things. And all Friends every where admonish one another, young and old, that ye do not run after the Worlds fashions, which are invented and set up by the vain and light mind; which if you do, How can ye judge the World for such things? Away with your* Skimmingdish-Hats, *and your unnecessary Buttons on your Cloaks and Coats, and on the tops of your shoulders behind, and on your sleeves: Away with your long* Slit-Peaks *behind on the skirts of your Waistcoats, and short Sleeves, punishing your shoulders so as you cannot have the use of your arms. Away with your short black Aprons, and some having none; Away with your* Vizzards, *whereby you are not distinguished from bad Women, and your* bare-Necks, *and your great needless flying Scarfs like Colours on your backs. And so set not up nor put on that which you did once with the Light condemn; but in all things be plain, that you may adorn the truth of the Gospel of Christ and judge the World, and keep in that which is comly and decent.*

George Fox.

Published with the consent of divers credible Persons, who will be ready upon any just occasion to give in their Testimonies concerning the matters of Fact herein contained, and at the instance of many,

By *Francis Smith.*